

4106 b. 4  
+  
R E M A R K S  
O N  
Dr. LOWTH's LETTER  
T O T H E  
BISHOP of GLOUCESTER.

W I T H  
The BISHOP's APPENDIX,  
A N D  
The SECOND EPISTOLARY CORRESPONDENCE  
between his Lordship and the Doctor annexed.

---

Ut omnium rerum, sic literarum, intemperantiâ laboramus.  
SENECA.

---

THE SECOND EDITION.

---

---

L O N D O N :  
Printed for L. DAVIES and C. REYMERS, opposite  
Gray's Inn Gate, Holbourn.  
MDCC LXVI.

REMARKS

ON

DR. LOWE'S LETTER

TO THE

BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER

WITH

THE BISHOP'S APPENDIX

AND

A SECOND EDITION

WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY THE EDITOR



THE SECOND EDITION

BY

THE EDITOR

OF THE

BRITISH MUSEUM



---

---

## P R E F A C E.

**I**F (amidst the *ribaldry* of these times, when the public taste seems capable of being gratified by nothing but ABUSE, whether in literary or political debates) a little *fair reasoning* may be heard, the following sheets, which only aim at vindicating the principle of TOLERATION against an Oxford Doctor, will have some claim to the Reader's attention: If for nothing else, yet for this, that it may possibly produce another Letter from the Doctor well seasoned, like the first, to the public taste. It must be owned, that the confutation of a man's principles, especially if accompanied with any degree of raillery, is enough to put him out of humour. But such a one would do well *to have reason in his rage*; and, when he ANSWERS, to distinguish between the abuse of an adversary's *writings* and of his *person*. Had the Doctor been either so wise or so honest, as to have done this, he had not been troubled with these Sheets: which yet (with all the right of retaliation) are confined solely to his argument.—To conclude. As

keen

een and fatirical as the Doctor represents the Bishop to have been in his Controversial Writings, in which he was only on the defensive against aggressors like the Doctor, yet he never left the Argument to fall upon the *Moral Character* of any Man, not even within the limits and bounds of truth; much less did he ever, like one enraged, attack it with atrocious falsehoods, as the Doctor hath done: for which, at a proper time, he may be brought to account.

REMARKS,

---

## REMARKS, &c.

**B**EFORE I enter on the argument, it may be expedient that the reader should know what high injury it was, which provoked Dr. Lowth to all his Billingsgate against the author of the Divine Legation.

The offence given by his lordship is an *Appendix* repelling Dr. Lowth's attack upon him; which therefore I shall give in his Lordship's own words at large.

### A P P E N D I X

#### Concerning the Book of JOB.

“ **A**N excellent Writer having *freely and candidly examined* the late Bishop of London's collection of Sermons, and in page 165 of his *Examination*, asked this question, *Where was Idolatry ever punished by the Magistrate, but under the Jewish Œconomy?* The Oxford Professor, in the second Edition of his *Prelections, concerning the sacred Poetry of the Hebrews*, thinks fit to give the following answer—“ It was punished under the Œconomy  
“ of the Patriarchs, in the families and under the  
“ DOMINION of Abraham, Melchisedec and JOB.  
“ Idolatry spreading wider and wider, Abraham  
“ was called by God from Chaldea, for this end,

B

“ to



“ to be the father of a People, which, divided  
 “ from all others, might continue to worship the  
 “ true God, to be set up for an exemplar of true  
 “ Religion, and to be ready to give testimony  
 “ against the worship of vain Deities. Was not  
 “ Abraham, therefore, (exercising the SOVEREIGN-  
 “ TY in his own family) to punish Idolatry?  
 “ Were not Melchisedec and Job, and all the  
 “ SOVEREIGNS of Tribes of that Time, who  
 “ still retained the knowledge and worship of  
 “ the true God, amidst a general defection of  
 “ all the surrounding People, to take care that  
 “ their own did not backslide? To curb of-  
 “ fenders, and to inflict punishment on the ob-  
 “ stinate, the REBELLIOUS, and on all those who  
 “ spread abroad the contagion of this vice.—

Ad quæstionem respondetur: Sub œconomia Pa-  
 triarcharum; in familiis, et sub DOMINATU Abra-  
 hami, Melchizedechi, Jobi cæterorumque. In-  
 gruenta Idololatria divinitus evocabatur ex Chal-  
 dæa Abrahamus; eum in finem, ut fieret pater  
 Gentis, quæ ab aliis omnibus divisa, verum Deum  
 coleret, publicum proponeret exemplum puræ re-  
 ligionis, contraque cultum vanorum numinum tes-  
 timonium perhiberet. Nonne erat igitur Abra-  
 hami in sua familia PRINCIPATUM exercentis pro-  
 prium officium & munus in Idololatriam ani-  
 madvertere? Nonne Melchizedechi, Jobi, omni-  
 umque tunc temporis in suis Tribubus PRINCI-  
 PUM, qui veri Dei cognitionem & cultum in com-  
 muni fere gentium circumvicinarum defectione  
 adhuc retinebant, cavere, ne sui deficerent; coer-  
 cere delinquentes; obstinatos & REBELLES, et  
 sceleris contagionem propagantes, supplicio affi-  
 cere?——*Supplementum ad primam Prælestio-*  
*num Editionem: Addit. Editionis secundæ, p. 312.*

This is so pleasant an answer, and so little needing the masterly hand of the *Examiner* to correct, that a few strictures, in a cursory Note, will be more than sufficient to do the business.

1. The *Examiner*, to prove, I suppose, that the book of Job was a dramatic work, written long after the time of the Patriarch, asks, *Where was Idolatry ever punished by the MAGISTRATE, but under the Jewish Economy?* The *Professor* answers, *It was punished under the JOBEAN ECONOMY.* And he advances nothing without proof. Does not Job himself say, that Idolatry was *an iniquity to be punished by the Judge?* The *Examiner* replies, that the Job who says this, is an airy Fantom, raised for other purposes than to lay down the Law for the Patriarchal times. The *Professor* maintains that they are all Asses, with ears as long as *Father Harduin's*, who cannot see that this is the true and genuine old Job. — In good time. *Sub Judice lis est*: And while it is so, I am afraid the learned *Professor* BEGS THE QUESTION; when, to prove that Idolatry was punished by the Magistrate, out of the land of Judea, he affirms that KING JOB punished it. If he say, he does not rest his assertion on this passage of the book of Job alone, but on the sacred Records, from whence he concludes that those CIVIL MAGISTRATES, Abraham and Melchisedec, punished Idolatry; I shall own he acts fairly, in putting them all upon the same footing; and on what ground that stands, we shall now see.

2. The *Examiner* says, *Where was Idolatry ever punished by the Magistrate, but under the Jewish Economy?* A question equivalent to this, — “Where was Idolatry punished by the civil Magistrate on the established Laws of the State, but in Judea?”

To which, the *Professor* replies, "It was punished by all the Patriarchal Monarchs, by king Job, king Abraham, and king Melchisedec."

*Of a noble race was Shenkin.*

But here, not one, save the last, had so much as a nominal title to civil Magistracy: And this last drops, as it were, from the clouds, without lineage or parentage; so that, tho' of *divine*, yet certainly not a Monarch of the true stamp, by *hereditary right*. The Critic therefore fails in his first point, which is, finding out civil Magistrates to do his hierarchical drudgery.

3. But let us admit our *Professor's* right of investiture, to confer this high office, and then see how he proves, that these his Lieges punished the crime of Idolatry by civil punishment. ABRAHAM, and the Patriarchs his descendants, come first under consideration. *What!* (says he) *was not Abraham, exercising the SOVEREIGNTY in his own family, to punish Idolatry?* Hobbes is, I believe, the only one (save our *Professor*) who holds that "Abraham had a right to prescribe to his family what Religion they should be of, to tell them what was the word of God, and to punish those who countenanced any Doctrine which he had forbidden." *Leviath.* chap. 40.—But God speaking of Abraham, says, *I know that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord, &c.* Gen xviii. 19. And Hobbes and our *Professor*, I suppose, regard this declaration as a clear proof of the divine doctrine of RESTRAINT in matters of Religion; especially when interpreted by their darling text of—*force them to enter in.* On the contrary, those who have been bred



bred up in the principles of *Toleration*, hold it to be a mere testimony (a glorious one indeed) of Abraham's pious and parental care to INSTRUCT his family in the Law of God. And it is well, it can go for no more, or I should fear the learned Professor would have brought in Isaac as a backslider to Idolatry; and his Father's laying him on the sacrificial Pile, as a kind of *Auto de fe*. Now, except in these two places of Abraham's history, of such wonderful force to support *intolerant* principles, the Patriarch appears in all others so averse to this inquisitorial spirit, that where God comes down to destroy Sodom, the *Father of the Faithful* intercedes, with the utmost importunity, for that *idolairous* as well as incestuous City. The truth is this, The usurped right of punishing for opinions, was first assumed and long ingrossed by Idolaters. And, if tradition may be believed, Abraham himself narrowly escaped the *Fire* for preaching against its Divinity. But this is not all. From his own conduct, and from the conduct of his posterity, he seems to have made one part of that fidelity *in keeping the way of the Lord*, (for which he is so nobly distinguished by God himself) to consist in inculcating the divine doctrine of Toleration. When JACOB and his family, without leave-taking, had departed from Laban, Rachel stole away her father's Gods. The old man followed and overtook them; and complaining of the theft, Jacob frankly answered, *With whomsoever thou findest thy Gods, let him not live*. Now, I would ask, was this condemnation on the offender denounced for *Idolatry*, or for the *Theft*? The words of the Patriarch, which immediately follow, determine this—*Before our brethren discern thou what is thine, with me, and take it to thee*. Well, Rachel, by a female stratagem, contrived to keep her father's Gods; for no better purpose, we may

may be sure, than that for which the good man employed so much pains to recover them. The *theft*, indeed, had it been discovered, would have been *punished by the Judge*: But, as for the *Idolatry*, which, from its nature, could not be long hid, the silence of Scripture shews it to have been *coram non Judice*. And so far was Rachel from being doomed to the fire, that we do not find, even her Gods underwent this punishment.

After the affair of the Shechemites, Jacob, by God's command, goes to Bethel: and there, in pious emulation of his grandfather's *care to keep the way of the Lord*, the text tells us, he commanded *his household and all that were with him, to put away the strange Gods from amongst them*. They obeyed, all was well; and not a word of *punishing by the Judge*. Indeed, these *Patriarchal Judges* were much better employed, and more suitably to their office, in punishing civil crimes and immoralities, as appears from the adventure of Judah and his daughter in law, Tamar.

MELCHISEDEC's story is a short one; he is just brought into the scene to *bless* Abraham in his return from conquest. This promises but ill. Had this *King and Priest of Salem* been brought in *curfing*, it had had a better appearance: for, I think, punishment for opinions, which generally ends in a *Fagot*, always begins with a *curse*. But we may be misled perhaps by a wrong translation. The Hebrew word to *bless* signifies likewise to *curse*, and, under the management of an intolerant Priest, good things easily run into their contraries. What follows, is his taking *Tythies* from Abraham. Nor will this serve our purpose, unless we interpret these *Tythies* into *Fines for non-conformity*; and then,  
by

by the  *blessing*, we can easily understand *absolution*. We have seen much stranger things done with the *Hebrew Verity*. If this be not allowed I do not see how we can elicit fire and fagot from this adventure; for I think there is no inseparable connection between *Tythes* and *Persecution*, but in the ideas of a Quaker.—And so much for king *Melchisedec*.

But the learned *Professor*, who has been hardily brought up in the keen Atmosphere of WHOLE-SOME SEVERITIES, and early taught to distinguish between *de facto* and *de jure*, thought it needless to enquire into *Facts*, when he was secure of the *Right*. And therefore, only slightly and superciliously asks, “What? was not Abraham, by his  
“ very princely office, to punish Idolatry? Were not  
“ Melchisedec and Job, and all the heads of  
“ Tribes, to do the same?” Why, no: and it is well for Religion that they were not. It is for its honour that such a set of persecuting Patriarchs is no where to be found, but in a *poetical Prelection*.

4. For in the last place, let it be observed, that as these Patriarchs *did not de facto* (which appears from their history) so they *could not de jure* (which appears from the laws of Nature and Nations) *punish Idolatry by the Judge*. Because, as hath been shewn, Idolatry is not amenable to civil Justice, but where it becomes *Crimen læsæ Majestatis*. It could not become the crime of lese-majesty under the Patriarchs, unless they had been Gods as well as KINGS. Indeed, they were as much one as the other. However, it is not pretended that their government, tho’ *Regal*, was *Theocratical* likewise. The Patriarchs, therefore, could not *punish Idolatry by the Judge*.

From



From the *Examiner*, the Professor (without the least provocation given him) proceeds to the Author of the *Divine Legation*: who, he will shew, is as ignorant, absurd, and mad-brained as Father Harduin himself.

The Author of the *Divine Legation* had said, that the Writer of the book of Job *observed decorum*, in imitating the manners of the early scene which he had proposed to adorn. To this, the Professor objects,—"I can never bring myself to allow to a SEMI-BARBAROUS POET, writing after the Babylonian Captivity, such a piece of subtilty and refinement."—A mighty piece of refinement truly, for a Writer, who lays his scene in an early age, to paint, the best he could, the manners of that age.—"Besides (says the Professor) which is the principal point, the style favours wonderfully of Antiquity, and its peculiar character is a certain primitive and noble simplicity. So that they who degrade this Book to the times posterior to the Babylonian Captivity, seem to judge almost as insanely of Hebrew literature as Father Harduin did of the Roman, who ascribed the golden Poems of Virgil, Horace, and the rest, to the iron ages of the Monks."—Verum Poetæ semibarbaro post Captivitatem scribenti tantam subtilitatem ut concedam, impetrare a me non possum. Porro vero Stylus Poemati, quod vel maximum est, præcipue vetustatem sapit; est ejus peculiaris character αρχαισμος. Adeo ut qui id infra Captivitatem Babyloniam deprimunt, non multo sanius in Hebraicis judicare videantur, quam in Latinis Harduinus; qui aurea Virgilii, Horatii, Cæterorumque poemata ferreis Monachorum Sæculis adscripsit. *Idem ib.*

The

The learned *Professor* is a little unlucky in his comparison. The age of Job, as fixed by him, and the age of the Writer of his history, as fixed by me, run exactly parallel, not with the times of Virgil and Frederic Barbarossa, as he would insinuate, but with those of Ennius and Virgil. Job, the hero of the Poem, lived in an *Age* when civil Society was but beginning to shew itself, and what is more, in a *Country* where it never yet was formed. And Ezra (whom I suppose to be the Author of the Poem) was an eminent Citizen in the most perfect civil government in the World; which, he was sent home, to restore, laden with the literary treasures of the East; treasures that had been long accumulating under the warm influence of a large and powerful Empire. From this second transplantation of the Republic, Science got footing in Judea; and true Religion took deeper root in the hearts of its Inhabitants. Henceforward, we hear no more of their absurd Idolatries. A strict *adherence* to the LAW now as much distinguished them from others, as did the *singularity* of the LAW itself. And a studious cultivation of the LANGUAGE, in which that Law was written, as naturally followed, as it did amongst the Sarazens, who cultivated the Arabic, on the same principle. And to understand how great this was in both, we need only consider, that each had the same aversion to a translation of their Law into a foreign language. It is true, that in course of time, when the Jewish Policy was abolished, and the Nation was become vagabond upon Earth, while the Arabs, on the contrary, had erected a great Empire, a manifest difference arose between them, as to the cultivation of the two Languages.—Yet for all this, the Professor calls Ezra, a SEMI-BARBARIAN; tho' we agree that he wrote by the inspiration

spiration of the Most High ; amidst the last blaze indeed, yet in the full lustre of expiring Prophecy.

But the learned Professor has an internal argument from TASTE \*, full as good as the other from *Chronology*. “ The book of Job favours of Antiquity, and those who cannot relish it, have as depraved a taste as Father Harduin, who could not distinguish Partridge from Horse-flesh.”

The truth is, the Greek and Latin Languages having, for many Ages, been the mother-tongues of two of the greatest People upon earth (who had shared between them the Empires of *Eloquence* and of *Arms*) became daily more and more copious by the cultivation of Arts ; and less and less pure by the extension of Commerce. In these two languages, there yet remains a vast number of writings on all sorts of Subjects. So that modern Critics (in the foremost rank of whom will always stand the incomparable BENTLEY) had by long application to them, through their various and progressive refinements and depravations from age to age, acquired a certain sagacity, in passing a tolerable judgment concerning the time of the Writer, by his style and manner. Now Pedantry, which is the ape of Criticism, would mimic the same talent of discernment, in the narrowest and most barren of all Languages ; little subject to change, both from the common genius of the East, and from the peculiar situation of a sequestered People. Of this language, long since become a dead one, the only remains are in one small Volume ; the contents of which, had not Providence been mercifully pleased to secure, while the Tongue was yet

\* See what hath been said on this head, in the 42d, 43d, and 44th pages of this volume.



living, by a translation into Greek, the HEBREW VERITY, transmitted to us in the manner it was found in the most ancient MSS, where no vowel-points are used, nor space left to distinguish one word from another, and where a great number of terms occur only once, would at this day be a mere arbitrary CIPHER, which every Rabinical or Cabalistic juggler might make the key of his unrevealed Mysteries.—“Idem accidit etiam Mahometanis (says Abraham Ekell.) ante inventa ab Ali Abnaditalebo puncta vocalia: Tanta enim legentium erat dissentio, ut nisi Othomanni coercita fuisset autoritate, et determinata lectio punctis, quæ Ali excogitaverat, JAM DE ALCORANO ACTUM ESSET.” And if this had been the case of the Arabic of the Alcoran, a copious and a living language, what had become of the Hebrew of the Bible? a very narrow and a dead one. Of which an ancient Jewish Grammarian gives this character: “Lingua ista [Arabica] elegans est, & longe lateque scriptis dilatata, et qui eam loquitur nulla dictione deficit: Lingua vero sancta pauca est præ illa, cum illius nihil extet nisi quod in Libris Scripturæ reperitur, *nec suppeditet omnes dictiones loquendi necessarias.*” Yet this is the language whose peculiarities of style and composition, correspondent to every age and time, the *Professor* seems to think, may be as easily distinguished as those of the Greek or Latin Classics. So much for the Author of the *Divine Legation*: and indeed too much, had not Mr. LOCKE’s defence been involved in his: that excellent person having declared (speaking of the words of Job, *that Idolatry was an iniquity to be punished by the Judge*) “THIS PLACE ALONE, WERE THERE NO OTHER, “is sufficient to confirm their opinion who conclude that book to be writ by a JEW.”

From the *Divine Legation*, the learned Professor turns again to the Examiner, who seems to sit heavy on his stomach.—This excellent Writer desired to know of the learned, *Where they could find a civil or religious Constitution out of Judæa, which declared that the Children should suffer for the crime of their Parents.* To which the Professor replies in these very words—*In præsens Horatiano illo versiculo contentus abito Examinatorum omnium CANDIDISSIMUS—For the present, let this MOST CANDID of all Examiners go about his business, and be thankful for this scrap of Horace,*

“ Delicta majorum immeritus lues,  
“ Romane.”—

This is true Poetical Payment; He is called upon for his reckoning, and he discharges it with an old Song. But the Examiner is not a man to take rhyme for reason. He asked for an *old system of Laws*; and the contemptuous Professor gives him an *old Ballad*: But a little more civility at parting had not been amiss; for he who did not spare the Bishop, would certainly demolish the Professor, should he take it into his head to examine the *Prælections* as he hath done the *Sermons*.”

---

THESE are the words of the *Appendix* as they are found at the end of the fifth volume of the *Divine Legation*. Let the Reader judge of the reproof, by the provocation; and then compare both with the Doctor's libellous Letter to his Lordship.—My part shall be to pick up as carefully as I can, from under his opprobrious and ribauld language, the little of argument to be found; and give it a fair and impartial examination.

The

The two points, to which I shall at present confine myself, are *the punishment of idolatry by the Patriarchs*; and *the punishment of children for the sins of their parents*.

In handling the first, I shall begin with the article of most consequence; To convict the Doctor of arguing on the principles of INTOLERANCE, and shew that his complaints of being *falsely* and *injuriously* accused on this head, are groundless and impertinent. I shall then consider the arguments he brings, to prove that the Patriarchs were impowered to punish idolatry; and detect and expose the sophistry, by which he has endeavoured to load and blacken the system of his learned adversary, and to hide and palliate the nakedness and deformity of his own. Lastly, I shall examine his objection to the Bishop's defence of the Jewish laws in punishing idolaters with death; and shew his inability to vindicate this part of the Mosaic constitution, without having recourse to the principle of the THEOCRACY.

Doctor Lowth complains, that he has been *atrociously* and *infamously abused* in this Appendix. And this, 1st, Because he is charged with maintaining the principle of intolerance and restraint in matters of religion. 2dly, Because he is represented as entertaining the same notion with *Filmer*, concerning the origin of civil government.

Let then the charge and the defence be fairly and impartially considered. The author of the book of Job says, "If I beheld the sun when it shined, or the  
" moon walking in brightness, and my heart hath  
" been secretly enticed, or MY MOUTH HATH KISSED  
" MY



“ MY HAND; this also were an iniquity *to be punished by the judge*, for I should have denied the “ God that is above \*.” The Doctor holds, that he is here speaking of the patriarchal judge or magistrate; and consequently must hold that the patriarchal judge or magistrate was authorized to suppress *the particular mode of idolatry here specified*, or to punish the idolater, *who kissed his hand with his mouth*, while he was worshipping the heavenly bodies. Now, whether this be, or be not, asserting the doctrine of intolerance and restraint in matters of religion, is the point in dispute.

Mr. *Locke* has proved, as clearly as reason itself can prove any thing, that civil government must have been constituted for one particular, determinate, and precise end. He has proved also, that this could be no other, than the security of the temporal interests, or the liberty and property, of man †. But how were the liberty, the property, or any of the civil interests of men in society, hurt by an idolater, when *he kissed his hand with his mouth*, while adoring the sun and moon?

This particular overt-act of idolatrous worship was not in itself immoral or civilly criminal. It had no tendency to disturb the peace and quiet of the state, and could have no peniculous and malignant influence on the interests of society, by hurting the morals of its followers. Since then the Doctor gives his *patriarchal magistrate* a right to suppress and restrain idolatry thus circumstanced, he gives him a right to suppress and restrain idolatry, *as*

\* xxxi, 26, 7, 8.

† Letters on Toleration.

*such*, or simply as it is a deviation and aberration from the worship of the one true God. In other words, he gives him a right to punish it as a speculative and religious error, or a false and erroneous persuasion concerning the proper object of divine worship. But is not asserting the punishment of speculative and religious error, or mere matter of opinion, asserting the doctrine of INTOLERANCE and PERSECUTION in its largest extent?

Again, Job says, “ This were an iniquity to be punished by the judge, *for I should have denied the God that is above.*” He must then have been speaking of political and civil laws, which punished idolatry *as such*, or purely as it was *the denial of the one supreme God*. But if punished *under this idea*, in any form of government, which was not Theocratical, it must have been punished purely as matter of opinion, or a wrong and mistaken apprehension concerning the proper object of divine worship.

All this is confirmed by the Doctor's own Answer, when asked, “ Where idolatry was punished by “ the magistrate, but under the Jewish œconomy?” He replies, “ Abraham was called out of his country, to preserve the worship of the true God in his family: And that, in order to keep them attached to this worship, he was commissioned to punish apostates, or those who revolted from the service of the one supreme Deity \*.” The Doctor does not confine and limit his commission to the punishment of apostacy, where it was productive of flagitious; immoral, and obscene practices; but extends it to all sorts of apostacy, without intimating any limi-

\* See the note quoted in the Appendix.

tation, distinction, or reserve. And this his argument necessarily required. For the purpose of Abraham's CALL was on a *religious*, not a *civil* account. It was for the preservation of the worship of the true God, and not for the security of the temporal interests of his family. Now, if he was to keep them attached to this worship by the infliction of secular punishment, *every* deviation and departure from it must have been cognizable by him. How could it be otherwise, since he was to punish idolatry *because it dishonoured the true God*, and not because it was prejudicial to Society by the practices required of its votaries?

He pretends also, that Abraham and the other patriarchal magistrates were to look upon idolaters as *rebels* and *traitors*\*, guilty of no less than *lese majesty*. They were then to look upon them as the proper objects of capital punishment. And what could the most bigotted INTOLERANT do more?

Now then let the Public judge, whether the Author of the Divine Legation has done him any injury, in charging him with being an advocate for *intolerance*.

In his *letter*, he is so far from exculpating himself from this Charge, that he has furnished new materials to convict him of it, beyond the possibility of a reply.

When called upon to show, “where idolatry  
“was punished by the magistrate, on the esta-  
“blished laws of the state, except in Judea;”——

\* Obstinatos et REBELLES——supplicio afficere.



he answers with much seeming complacency and satisfaction; “ well then, my Lord, to give you  
 “ all the *satisfaction* in my power, be pleased to  
 “ turn to Statut. Noach. c. 3. in the PATRIAR-  
 “ CHAL STATUTE-BOOK,——which you may find  
 “ in the Gemara Babylonica ad Tit. Sanhedrim,  
 “ c. 7. fol. 56. Indeed, my Lord, the Præcepta  
 “ Noachidarum have been considered by the  
 “ learned, not as altogether an idle dream of the  
 “ rabbins, but as a subject of some importance,  
 “ being agreeable to holy scripture, and in other  
 “ respects much better founded than most that  
 “ are accounted traditionary doctrines. The very  
 “ learned Selden has thought it worth while to  
 “ treat of them at large in a considerable work,  
 “ of which they make the principal subject: and  
 “ it is the universal opinion of the Jewish lawyers  
 “ of all ages, derived perhaps chiefly from this tra-  
 “ dition, that idolatry was punished under the pa-  
 “ triarchs. And they, agreeable to their own laws,  
 “ make it a capital crime. Their decision on the  
 “ point, as expressed in the Gemara Babylonica  
 “ is this; Ob violationem alicujus e septem præ-  
 “ ceptis Noachidarum, morte afficitur. De unico  
 “ (sc. homicidio) aperte effatus est Deus ipse. At-  
 “ que eadem ratio est cunctorum \*.”

Certainly the learned Doctor could never give an Adversary more *satisfaction* than in shewing himself reduced to take refuge amidst the lies and nonsense of Rabbinical Drivellers.—These precepts command men “ to worship the true God,  
 “ and to renounce idols, and all idolatrous wor-  
 “ ship †.” If then these precepts made part of

\* P. 44, 5.

† Ut unum Deum colerent, et ab idololatria abstinerent.

the PATRIARCHAL STATUTE-BOOK, this statute-book must have prohibited and proscribed *every* defection from the worship of the true God, and *every* lapse into idolatry and idolatrous worship, without any regard to, or consideration of, the particular circumstances, with which it might be accompanied. When therefore the Doctor affirms, that the patriarchal Magistrate had a right to inflict *capital* punishment on the transgressors of these precepts, does he not affirm the doctrine of INTOLERANCE in all its plenitude?

This universal and undistinguishing prohibition of idolatry might be very proper in a DIVINE CODE: But when once it becomes part of a PATRIARCHAL STATUTE-BOOK, and that, all which God forbids, the magistrate is obliged to punish,

“Redeunt Saturnia regna.”

*Human sacrifices* (but after the mode of the *Inquisition*) will come again in fashion; and the learned Doctor shall, by my good will, have an IMPRIMATUR for an exclusive right of commenting on this new-discovered PATRIARCHAL STATUTE-BOOK, like that given to him who first found the *Florentine Pandects*. And indeed he will deserve it. For if he can shew that the *Præcepta Noachidarum* were given by God, and these transferred into this PATRIARCHAL STATUTE-BOOK, he will do more for INTOLERANCE than all his Precursors in this glorious cause. For it will invincibly establish *the divine right and origin* of the practice. We have heard of the *divine right of Kingship*, the *divine right of Episcopacy*, the *divine right of Presbytery*. And they have all had their day. But who would have imagined that the DIVINE RIGHT OF PERSECUTION was reserved for the

the days of Liberty? and that what we have hitherto mistaken for one of the wickedest imps of hell, was indeed of heavenly extraction. Some may, perhaps, expect better evidence than Jewish traditions, before they willingly give up the unalienable right of private judgment in matters of religion. They who are content to take up with this, under the quaint name of a *Patriarchal statute-book*, can hardly think this great Prerogative of human Nature worth contending for.

Lastly, Jacob, going to celebrate a solemn act of religious worship, says to his family, "Put away the strange gods that are among you, and be clean, and change your garments\*." Upon this the Doctor says, "A command issued by a superior, in an authoritative manner, and in due form, plainly implies a right, and a power, and a will to enforce obedience to the command: the Patriarch issues a command against idolatry; therefore the Patriarch had a right, and a power to punish idolatry, and would have punished it in those, whom he should have found guilty of the crime†." Since he gives Jacob a right to punish all who did not obey the command issued by him, he must give him a right to punish those who neglected to *purify themselves*, and to *change their garments*, as well as those who refused to put away their *strange gods*. Let the Doctor alone for a thorough Disciplinarian. At first it was only conformity to the worship of the God acknowledged. We now find in this *Patriarchal statute book* there was an *act of uniformity to rites and ceremonies*, such as *making themselves clean, and changing their garments*.

\* Genesis, xxxv. 2.

† P. 32.



And now, let me ask, where is the want of *candour* in saying the Doctor maintains the principle of *intolerance*? Does his Importance expect the peculiar privilege of being exempted from the imputation and opprobrium of holding doctrines expressly delivered in his writings?

He complains of *misrepresentation*. It is indeed much easier to *misrepresent* than *detect*. And it is much easier to complain of *misrepresentation*, than to defeat the charge. I never found a *fair detection* called otherwise, by those it concerned, than a *misrepresentation*. I know of no other remedy to these evils, than suffering Reason to decide. But who is ready to do this, amongst the Sons of controversy?

His second charge is, that he is represented in the Appendix advancing the same notions with *Filmer*, concerning the origin of civil government. If he is unjustly accused, let the calumny fall on the Author of the *Divine Legation*. If justly, the severest thing the Public can inflict, will be the infamy of holding the doctrine imputed to him.

He was asked, “ Where idolatry was ever punished by the MAGISTRATE, but under the *Jewish œconomy*.”—To this he replied, “ It was punished under the œconomy of the *Patriarchs*, in the families, and under the DOMINION of Abraham, Melchisedec, and Job.—Was not Abraham therefore (exercising the SOVEREIGNTY in his own family) to punish idolatry? Were not Melchisedec, and Job, and all the SOVEREIGNS of tribes of that time, who still retained the knowledge of the true God, amidst a general defection of all the surrounding people, to take care that their own did not backslide? To curb offences, and to inflict punishment on the obstinate,

“nate, the REBELLIOUS, and on all those who  
 “spread abroad the contagion of this vice.” He  
 speaks, you see, of the Fathers of families and Heads  
 of tribes as such, exercising *dominion* and *sovereignty*  
 over their dependents. To make his answer  
 pertinent and relative to the question, he must speak  
 of them as exercising *CIVIL dominion* and *sovereignty*,  
 or the power and authority, properly apper-  
 taining to MAGISTRATES. Now is not this speak-  
 ing the language, and publicly avowing the senti-  
 ments, of FILMER?

If then the Author of the D. L. was guilty  
 of *calumny* and *defamation*, it must be *calumny* and  
*defamation* to suppose that the Doctor intended  
 to speak to the very purpose which his argument re-  
 quired he should speak to.—That he intended to  
 make the Fathers of families, or Heads of tribes,  
*civil Sovereigns*, or Kings and Monarchs, in the strict  
 and proper sense of the words, appears from his giving  
 them power to punish idolaters as TRAITORS and RE-  
 BELS, guilty of no less than *lese majesty*.

Since this, in his Letter to the Bishop, he not  
 only lays himself under a necessity of adopting,  
 but has given very strong proofs of his predilection  
 for, the PATRIARCHAL SCHEME of FILMER.

His hypothesis of a PATRIARCHAL STATUTE-  
 BOOK, containing the *Præcepta Noachidarum*, will  
 oblige him to suppose the existence of *civil* govern-  
 ment in the time of Noah. And how can he sup-  
 pose its existence in this early period, without list-  
 ing himself among the followers of FILMER?

Having observed that Abraham is called in the  
 Greek translation of the Seventy, βασιλεὺς παρὰ θεῶν\*,

\* Genesis, xxiii. 6.

he adds, "So there is at once both *divine right*,  
 " and *regal title* \*." What pity any thing should  
 be wanting, though it were but such a trifle as com-  
 mon sense, in this interpretation of the Septuagint.—  
 However this, certainly, is giving all the sanction  
 to his *patriarchal scheme*, which FILMER himself  
 could desire.

The late Lord Bolingbroke severely reprov'd  
 Hooker and Locke, for considering men as *simple*  
*individuals*, and not as ranked under tribes and fa-  
 milies, when they were deducing the origin of ci-  
 vil society. The Bishop assumes the honour of  
 defending them, and observes, that the real origin  
 of civil society was equally shewn, whether men  
 were previously considered as individuals, or as  
 members of families. He then adds, "Had they  
 " considered men before civil society as ranked un-  
 " der tribes, the RIGHTS belonging to the heads of  
 " families, *though neither relative to, nor connected*  
 " *with, those of a civil kind*, might have too much  
 " countenanced that absurd system, which derives  
 " *political* from *patriarchal* rule; a system which,  
 " both for its absurdities and mischiefs, it was the  
 " purpose of LOCKE and HOOKER to expose and  
 " discredit. The former therefore did judiciously,  
 " to assert, as he might do it truly, (*for the exer-*  
 " *cise of justice* no more belongs to the fathers  
 " of families *as such*, than *the exercise of regal*  
 " *prerogative*) that before the institution of civil  
 " society, *every one of these independent inhabitants*  
 " *of the earth did, or might, exercise justice for*  
 " *himself and others, on those who violated the*  
 " *law* †."

\* Genesis, lvi.

† Alliance, 4th Edition. Appendix, p. 65.



This vindication of Locke and Hooker has drawn the following animadversion from Dr. Lowth. “ I perceive your Lordship has, *for some time, born no good will to these old Patriarchs; you have determined to allow them no rights, either relative, or connected with, those of a civil kind.* You are afraid, it seems, lest Sir Robert Filmer’s Patriarch, long since dead and forgotten, should come again and haunt us; and you think it would be making surer work to annihilate the person himself both soul and body before-hand, than to stay to lay the ghost of him, after he may appear, being under no such apprehension myself, &c. \*”

Now when the Bishop says, “ The RIGHTS of heads of families were neither relative to, nor connected with those of *a civil kind;*” what does he more than second Mr. Locke in asserting against Filmer, that *paternal* and *civil* power are not the same in *kind*, or that the rights of Magistrates are not derived from the same root and original with the rights of Parents. For that they are both the same in *kind*, being equally derived from the same source, is the grand and fundamental principle of Filmer’s system. When, therefore, the Doctor censures the Bishop for distinguishing with Mr. Locke, between *paternal* and *civil* power, or for holding that *political* rule did not arise out of, or spring from *patriarchal*, he plainly turns advocate for FILMER against LOCKE.

He is so warm a zealot, as even to make the cause of Sir Robert and the *Patriarchs* one and the

same. For if the Bishop will persist in holding Mr. Locke's distinction, and affirming that political and paternal power do not come from the same stock, he can ascribe it to nothing but the *odium and ill-will* he bears to the *Patriarchs*.

SO MUCH to convict our Doctor of the charge of arguing on the principles of intolerance and civil slavery.—And is this the man, who values himself on “his generous freedom of thought, and “boasts of having breathed the same *atmosphere* with “HOOKER and LOCKE \*?” A strange declaration! at the very time he was defending Filmer against these illustrious writers.

“You are afraid,” (says the Doctor to the Bishop) “lest Sir Robert Filmer's patriarch should “come again, and haunt us.—Being under no “no such apprehensions myself”——

He laughs at the Bishop for supposing that to make fathers of families, *as such*, civil governors, or to derive *political* from *patriarchal* power, tends to revive the *patriarchal* scheme of Filmer. He might as justly laugh at him for supposing, the denial of the moral attributes of the Deity tends to countenance and revive the naturalism of Bolingbroke.

You are afraid “lest Sir Robert's Patriarch “should come again and haunt us.”—The Bishop was under no apprehension either of Sir Robert, or any of his Followers. All he asks, is liberty to laugh at the nonsense of their system, especially at a time when the same ridiculous trash is ready to be ob-

eruded on us, a second time, and with a more solemn air, by the illustrious Discoverer of the *Patriarchal Statute-book*. Sir Robert's was the issue of an *arbitrary Court*, this comes from an *Academic lecturer*.

“ Being (says he) under no such *apprehension* myself”—*i. e.* under no apprehensions that Filmer's Patriarch should revive and flourish once more. And pray, Sir, who charged you with any such apprehensions? All the apprehension you discovered was lest your *Statute-book* should fall under the same disgrace with Sir Robert's *Patriarch*. Were you apprehensive of any thing else it seems to be, lest your calumny concerning the Bishop's SPITE to the holy Patriarchs should not be believed.

Could, indeed, the Doctor prove, that the fathers of families, *as such*, are political and civil rulers, there would be an end of Liberty and man's civil freedom, or the privilege to chuse under what particular government and governors he will live. The notion of an *original compact*, making the Magistrate a creature of the people, and deriving all civil authority from them, will be as visionary and groundless, as the patrons of passive obedience and non-resistance have laboured to represent it \*.

Had our Doctor stuck to his original plan, he would have found himself obliged to prove, that the Patriarchs were not only Kings, but Gods likewise.

For

\* “ No man, unless he be a follower of *Filmer*, and a maintainer of the *divine hereditary right* of Kings, will pretend to say that PATERNITY and MONARCHY are equally derived from the same source. Those who have exploded the doctrine

E

“ of



For he set out with asserting, that they were to punish idolaters as *rebels*, guilty of no less than *high treason*! Now under a Theocracy, idolaters may be looked on as *traitors* and *rebels*, because divine worship and adoration is part of the *allegiance* or *civil duty*, which the subject owes to the supreme magistrate. To shew then that idolaters were chargeable with high treason, or that they withdrew from their patriarchal monarchs the allegiance due to them, the Doctor must shew that divine worship and adoration was part of this allegiance. It is true, the modest Sir Robert was content with one half of this admirable system. But what then! The reverend doctor has fairly won the other. And what he has won, surely he may wear.

We will consider next the arguments which he has brought, to shew that the Patriarchs were authorised to punish idolatry.

He has taken much pains to shew, that idolatry was not punishable in a state of nature, but only by the magistrate, after the establishment of civil society. “Idolatry says he, in a state of nature, though a crime against the law of nature; must be left to the judgment of God; seeing

“of PASSIVE OBEDIENCE and NON-RESISTANCE, tell another story. They say, that fathers and Patriarchs must remain fathers and Patriarchs; and can never either ripen or degenerate into Kings, as coming from a very different stock: that these latter arose from *con act*, and were the creatures of the people; that the will of God, discoverable by natural reason, gave the immediate right to FATHERS; and that the will of man, discoverable by human actions, gave the immediate right to KINGS.”

New edition of the Alliance, p. 51.

“there

“ there is no human jurisdiction, which can properly interpose to restrain it.

“ But in a state of civil society, which is supposed in this question, this defect is supplied :  
 “ the civil law is superinduced, and comes in aid  
 “ of the natural law ; and puts in execution in many instances, in which it could not be executed before. The magistrate becomes the *minister of God, an avenger to execute wrath upon every one that doeth evil* ; upon every vice, every immorality, every crime against the law of nature ;  
 “ AS FAR AS IT MAY HAVE A PERNICIOUS EFFECT  
 “ UPON CIVIL SOCIETY, and as far as it came under  
 “ his cognizance \*.”

Since then he lays it down as a principle, that idolatry is not punishable in a state of nature, but only by the Magistrate, after the establishment of civil society ; it will be incumbent on him to shew, that the Patriarchs were *civil* governors. And what has he alledged to this purpose ?——Or what can he possibly alledge, without having recourse to the exploded and antiquated system of Filmer ?

But he says, “ Will not the title itself of PATRIARCH be sufficient for my purpose ? Though  
 “ Job and Abraham were not Kings, yet might they  
 “ not be really and effectually rulers of tribes †.”  
 Indeed, Sir, I am afraid not, unless your *sufficiency* comes in aid of theirs. For your great and fundamental principle is, that idolatry is only punishable by the Magistrate in a state of civil society. On this principle, you must either prove that the *patriarchal* was truly and properly *civil* government,

\* P. 55.

† P. 55.

or give up the point in dispute, and own that you can find no magistrate to do your hierarchical drudgery.

He asks, "whether there are not other systems of civil government besides monarchy \*?" Without doubt, there are. And could he have shewn, the Patriarchs presided in *any civil government*, I should never have quarrelled with him about the form or mode. But since he is conscious that his argument required him to do this, and yet has not attempted to do it, I need not ask the reason of his omission.

His argument called upon him to prove, not only that they were civil governors, but even that they were Kings and Monarchs. For he had described and represented them as such, when he affirmed the fathers of families and heads of tribes were empowered to exercise *civil authority*, and to punish idolatry as *high treason*. For is not *high treason* a crime against the *supreme Magistrate*? And is not the father of a family, exercising civil authority among his children and household, strictly and properly a *King or Monarch*?

The Bishop therefore spoke directly to the point, when he said, "The Doctor might as easily prove they were Gods as Kings."

And how does the Doctor represent this? Why, thus; "You set out with asserting, ~~that~~ the Patriarchs were not civil magistrates, because they were not Kings. I was somewhat surprized both



“ at the assertion, and the reason by which it was supported \*.” Miserable chicane ! It was not the Bishop’s business to prove they were *not* civil magistrates. It was incumbent on the Doctor to prove that they were. *AFFIRMANTI incumbit probatio.*

After the Doctor had described and represented them as Kings and Monarchs, or fixed and ascertained the particular mode of government which was the subject of dispute, what had his adversaries to do, but to demand proofs of its real existence, or of the kingship and monarchy of the Patriarchs ?

But he is at length provoked to give a more direct answer : “ If, says he, I had at all apprehended “ it to be necessary, I believe I could have offered “ some proof that these Patriarchs were Kings. As “ thus : Abraham is called in the book of Genesis “ (xxiii. 6.) according to the translation of the “ Seventy, βασιλεὺς παρὰ θεοῦ. So there is once both “ *regal title* and *divine right* †.” To shew our Doctor how much this *regal title* and *divine right* are to the purpose of his present argument, I will here present him with the following observations on this text, by the late excellent Bishop Hoadley, in his *Examination of the Patriarchal scheme of Filmer.*

“ The *children* of *Heth* do indeed tell *Abraham*, “ that he was a *Prince of God*, or MIGHTY PRINCE “ amongst them, v. 6. But we know he was a *stran-* “ *ger* or *sojourner* with them, v. 4. Without any

\* P. 51, 2.

\* P. 55, 6.

“ right

“ right to any *government*, but of his own *family*.—  
 “ And this gives us another good hint, that even,  
 “ in those days, there were few *monarchs*, in the  
 “ modern notion, settled and heard of in these  
 “ parts, when Abraham, though a *traveller* and a  
 “ *stranger*, was accounted a great *Prince*, because  
 “ God had *blessed him with a numerous family of his*  
 “ *own descendants and servants*. *Family-government*  
 “ seems, at that time, to have been of use, and not  
 “ to have been so over-ruled or swallowed up, by a  
 “ settled form of *civil government* set over it, as it  
 “ was afterwards \*.”

Hence we see the futility of arguing from the words *Kings* and *Princes*, as if they had, in the more early ages, been understood in the same sense, and used to signify any of that *civil authority and power*, which they do now.

In these early times they might often be applied to persons, who were no more *Kings* and *Monarchs*, in the modern sense of the words, than the *Little Carpenter* amongst the savage Americans.

Having assured us, in a passage above-quoted, that idolatry is not punishable in a state of nature, he adds, “ The magistrate becomes *the minister of*  
 “ *God, an avenger to execute wrath upon every one*  
 “ *that doeth evil*; upon every vice, every immora-  
 “ lity, every crime against the law of nature, AS FAR  
 “ AS IT MAY HAVE A PERNICIOUS EFFECT ON CI-  
 “ VIL SOCIETY †.”

The magistrate then is to punish idolatry SO FAR  
 AS IT MAY HAVE A PERNICIOUS EFFECT ON SO-

\* P. 64, 5.

† P. 55.

CIETY. And could he have told us in plainer terms, that the magistrate had nothing to do with the idolater mentioned in the book of Job, who *kissed his hand with his mouth*, while he was worshipping the heavenly bodies? Could he have told us in plainer terms, that he was not to punish idolatry under the idea mentioned in the book of Job, or as it was the *denial* or renunciation of the one true God? And, lastly, how could he have told us more directly, that his PATRIARCHAL STATUTE-BOOK, sentencing all idolaters without distinction to capital punishment, was only the delirium of some old doting Rabbi, or Jewish Lawyer? It was then a little unlucky in our learned Doctor, to erect his system on a position which entirely overturns it.

The Advocate for intolerance, against whom Mr. Locke wrote his celebrated Letters on Toleration, brought this passage of the book of Job to prove, that the patriarchal magistrate had a power to punish for opinion, or to punish religious error, as such, without any consideration of the civil mischief, or hurt it might do the state\*. Since Dr. Lowth agrees with this intolerant, in supposing this text proves that the patriarchal magistrates punished the particular species of idolatry there mentioned, and punished it *as the denial of the one supreme God*; how can he help agreeing with him in supposing that they punished for opinion, or punished religious error, as such, without any regard to the consideration of the mischief it might do the public?

The best of it is, the Doctor would maintain, with Mr. Locke's Adversary, that the Magistrate was commissioned to punish idolatry, under the par-

\* Third Letter on Toleration.



ticular circumstances mentioned in the book of Job. He would maintain also, with Mr. Locke, that the magistrate was commissioned to punish no religious worship, but what interfered with the good of society. He might as rationally and consistently talk of holding a vacuum with Newton, and a plenum with Des Cartes.

Had he been master of his argument, he would have known that Mr. Locke applied *this very principle* to shew, that the author of the book of Job could not be speaking of the patriarchal magistrate, but was alluding to the Jewish Theocracy. The Doctor might have seen too, that if he accedes to the *principle*, he must accede to the *conclusion*. For, on this principle, idolatry, as such, or every species of idolatry without exception, can be liable to civil punishment in no form of government, which is not Theocratical.

This perpetual shifting of his arms, or his indiscriminately assuming the principle of Mr. Locke, and the principle of Mr. Locke's Adversary, is more than a thousand arguments to shew how little reason he has to value himself *on having breathed the same atmosphere with Locke and Hooker*. It is just as if an advocate for Christianity should sometimes assert, and sometimes deny, the truth of the Miracles, on which its divine origine is founded. Was it for such reasoning as this, that the names of Locke and Hooker have been so long and so justly celebrated?

But to which of these two contrary principles will the Doctor stick; the principle of Mr. Locke, or the principle of Mr. Locke's Intolerant? Alas! his notion of the high antiquity of the book of Job will confine him to the latter.

This

This notion will oblige him to give the patriarchal magistrate a power of punishing idolatry, *as it was the denial of the one true God*, i. e. a power of punishing for *opinion* as such. And if what he *gives* be not given gratis, it is either because he thinks that force and violence have a natural efficacy to operate conviction, or that conformity without conviction is serviceable to the true Religion.

He must give his patriarchal Magistrate the prerogative of judging for his subjects in matters of Religion, and of prescribing what particular mode of worship they shall follow. For if he hath not this prerogative, it is certain he can have no right to punish them for Non-conformity.

The Doctor, perhaps, may say, he never asserted that force had any natural efficacy to operate conviction, or that the magistrate was to prescribe to his subjects what religion they were to be of. And so said Mr. Locke's Intolerant. But what then? Mr. Locke did not think himself hindered, by his Adversary's denial of these consequences, from persisting to charge him with them, as they flowed necessarily from the principle, *that the Magistrate had a right to punish for opinion*. And the Doctor assures us, that Mr. Locke *never treated his adversaries in an ungenerous, illiberal, and uncandid manner*.

The only way the Doctor has to extricate himself from these difficulties, is to shew, that the patriarchal magistrate had a right to punish the particular *mode of idolatry described by Job*, and a right to punish idolatry, *as it is the denial of the one supreme God*; and yet had no right to *punish for opinion*. Till he does this, I must remind him once again, that he has

F

been

been laying a lasting foundation for the practice of *intolerance* and restraint in matters of religion. For if force was ever useful to operate conviction, it must be so still, unless the frame and constitution of human nature has been a second time altered.—If the Magistrate had once a right to punish idolatry, as such, i. e. to punish for opinions, he must have the same right now. For his coercive power must have been always limited and circumscribed within the same bounds, since the end of civil government was always the same.

He will give great advantages both to the Deists and the Intolerants. The first will triumph in a circumstance, which enables them to load the Patriarchs with the odious and detestable name of Persecutors: and the Intolerants will not be a little pleased to find they may plead the example of these holy venerable men, to justify them in punishing for opinions, and making penal laws against all who dissent from the established Faith.

Indeed a much better writer seems incautiously to have fallen into the sentiment, which Dr. Lowth deliberately and pertinaciously maintains, after its pernicious tendency hath been fully and openly exposed. It is the Reverend Dr. Leland, who says, “ In the time of Job, which was probably before Moses, idolatry was looked upon as a great iniquity, *to be punished by the judge*\*.”

According to this writer, a deviation from the worship of the true God was punishable by the civil

\* Vol. I. p. 98. of *Advantage and Necessity of the Christian Revelation*. He refers to Job xxxi. 26, 27, 28.



power, in the time of the Patriarchs. He holds too that the patriarchal religion was *really* and *essentially* the same with the *Christian*†. It will follow then that *the kingdom of Christ* was once a kingdom of *this world*, since it was supported and propagated by temporal and worldly power. *Compel them to enter in*, must, in its very literal meaning, have been the language of the Gospel in those days.

Now what need the Intolerants ask, or what can their cause require, more than this concession, that the *spirit of persecution* was once the *spirit of the Gospel*? In vain will this ingenious and learned writer dissuade Christian magistrates from persecution by any considerations drawn from the iniquity of the practice, the nature and genius of the Gospel of Christ, or the inefficacy of force to make true and real converts. How, say they, can we do better than imitate the practice of these virtuous and holy patriarchs; especially *the Father of the Faithful*? How is it possible to imagine the nature of the Gospel is essentially altered, and become the very reverse of what it was formerly? How can it be said that force is of no use and efficacy to operate conviction now, if it once had this efficacy?

But to return to Dr. Lowth; and proceed to detect, unravel and expose the sophistry, by which he has endeavoured to load and blacken the system of his learned adversary, and to hide and palliate the nakedness and deformity of his own.

“ I hope,” says he, addressing himself to the Bishop, “ *it will not offend your Lordship’s moderation,*

† View of Deistical Writers.

“ if I exclude from toleration all those, who make  
 “ practices shocking to humanity, and destructive  
 “ of the human race itself, parts of their religious  
 “ worship; such as murders, prostitutions, and  
 “ impurities of all kinds; the horrid sacrifices of  
 “ Moloch, in which parents offered up their own  
 “ children, and burnt them alive to appease the idol;  
 “ the obscene rites of Baal-peor, in which the most  
 “ shameless prostitutions were permitted and encouraged at least, if not necessarily required \*.”

*His Lordship's moderation offended*—By what? Why, by the inforcement and recommendation of his own doctrine. For both the principles of the *Alliance* and the *Divine Legation* deny a toleration to all Religions, encouraging the perpetration of such actions, as are detrimental and hurtful to the State. To insinuate even so much, that his Lordship had been silent on this important question, is so profligate and shameful a representation, that nothing but the Doctor's own words can make it credible. Many a writer has been tempted to misrepresent an adversary, in hopes the reader may never see his book. But our Doctor can preserve the character of an honest man no otherwise, than by confessing that he himself never saw it.

He pretends here, that he limits the civil power to the suppression of idolatrous worship, where it is contaminated and defiled with *unnatural prostitutions, human sacrifices, or vicious, immoral, and debauched practices*.—But does not his application of the passage in Job to the patriarchal Magistrates, give them a power to punish the idolater

\* P. 48, 49.

*who barely kissed his hand with his mouth*, and went no further into the guilt of Idolatry? Does not this application give them a power to punish idolatry, *as the denial of the true God*; and consequently to punish it, where it was not polluted and deformed with the horrid and impure practices above mentioned? Does he not give them this unlimited and unrestrained power, when he speaks of their punishing idolatry as *high treason*, and of their being authorized to keep men attached to the worship of the true God by compulsion and force? Has he not since in his *Letter*, given Jacob a right to punish even for NON-CONFORMITY, the non-observance of the rites and ceremonies of the public worship? Does not his PATRIARCHAL STATUTE-BOOK denounce sentence of death on every Idolater without distinction?

But as he often assumes the language of the Advocates for *toleration* and religious liberty, he hopes, this may serve to cover and disguise the malignity of his system from the inattentive and incautious reader.

“ I would (says he) have no application of fire and  
 “ faggot, no capital punishment, no propagating of  
 “ established religion by force; no imposing modes  
 “ of faith, opinions or ceremonies.—In short, I would  
 “ have her (the *patriarchal church*) employ her power  
 “ only in hindering the importation of foreign im-  
 “ moralities; particularly in excluding a species of  
 “ idolatry, not only highly immoral in itself, but  
 “ moreover attended with a train of the grossest im-  
 “ purities, and the most abominable vices, that  
 “ ever disgraced human nature \*.”

He was here speaking of a supposed *alliance* between the *patriarchal church and state*. In this, his

\* P. 44. 5.



Politics are a little premature. He is for making an *Alliance between Church and State* before either of them existed.

“ I would, says he, have no application of fire “ and faggot; *no capital punishment.*” But of what use is it to religious liberty, that he denies the *Church* a power of punishing *capitally* in matters of religion, while he gives it to the *State*? Does he not make idolatry *rebellion or high treason*? and is not *rebellion or high treason* a *capital* offence? Does he not concur with his *Jewish lawyers* in giving the patriarchal Magistrate a power to punish all sorts of idolatry with death? And, after this, it is, of very little consequence, whether the execution is to be by *fire and faggot*, or by other gentler means. This puts me in mind of a late ingenious Advocate for Rome; who is as chary of his Church as the Doctor can be of his. The Church of Rome, says the Historian, is no Persecuter. For why? It is the *secular arm* which does all the mischief.

“ I would have (says the Doctor) no propagating “ established religion by force.” But was not the public religion upheld *by force*, when idolatry, or the deviation from the established worship, was capitally punished by the magistrate?

“ No imposition of opinions.”—Were not *opinions imposed*, when Abraham treated as *traitors and rebels* all those who did not conform to the worship of the true God; and when idolatry, *as the denial of one supreme Deity*, came under the cognizance of the Magistrate? And how could opinions be MORE FORCIBLY imposed than by the greatest of all human penalties, the infliction of death?

“ I would

“ I would have her employ her power only in  
 “ hindering the importation of *foreign immoralities*;  
 “ particularly in excluding a *species of idolatry*, not  
 “ only highly immoral in itself, but moreover at-  
 “ tended with a train of the *grosslest impurities*, and  
 “ the most *abominable vices*.”

Now what *foreign immoralities*, except the simple adoration of false Gods, were imported by the Idolater, who *kissed his hand with his mouth*, while he was worshipping the sun and moon? Why does he talk of a *particular species of idolatry*, attended with a train of the *grosslest impurities*, and the most *abominable vices*? Does not his application of the passage in the book of Job; his hypothesis of the patriarchal Statute-book; and his making idolatry *rebellion* and *high treason* under the Patriarchal government; require him to subject EVERY species of idolatry to civil punishment, whether it be or be not attended with the gross vices and impurities he has heaped up in his imagination?

The question, you see, was whether the Magistrate was authorized to punish idolatry universally, or in all cases, without any regard to the *particular rites and practices with which it is accompanied*. To what purpose then is it for Dr. Lowth to repeat that the Magistrate has a right to suppress and restrain it, when it hurts Society, by promoting licentiousness and debauchery? To what purpose is it to repeat that it may be repressed in *some particular circumstances*, when the argument made it necessary for him to prove that it might be repressed *indiscriminately* and *promiscuously* in all?

Again; he charges the Bishop with “pretending  
 “ that idolatry is but an opinion, that *the gross act*  
 “ of

“ of adoration paid to false Gods is a mere speculation.”

“ Even upon your own principles,” (says this honest man) “ that *the grossest act of idolatrous worship* “ is no more than a mere speculative opinion\*. “ For your *pretence*, that idolatry is but an opinion, “ that the gross act of adoration paid to false Gods “ is a mere speculation, this is such a banter upon “ reason and common sense, that you could never “ mean it in earnest.” What does he mean by *gross acts of idolatry, and gross acts of idolatrous worship*? Why, the several *impurities, murders, and prostitutions* above mentioned. He roundly charges the Bishop with affirming that THESE were only a *speculation, or speculative opinion*.

Every one, who has not read the *Alliance and the Divine Legation*, will naturally imagine the Bishop had declared all these profligate and flagitious actions to be no more than a *speculative opinion*. Every one, who has read these works, will be astonished to find that the Bishop has not given the least shadow of a ground for so unjust a censure.

When the Bishop speaks of idolatry as being a mere speculative opinion, he is speaking of idolatry at large and in the abstract, or merely as it implies the worship of false deities in opposition to that of the true God. And when viewed in this light, it is nothing more than a false judgment and opinion concerning the proper object of divine worship. It presents nothing to be punished by the magistrate but mere speculative and religious error. It is evident that the Bishop, in his *Appendix*, was speaking of idolatry at large, or purely as it was a departure from the

\* P. 17, 61.



worship of the Supreme Cause of all Things. For the question was, whether the Patriarchs were authorized to punish the idolater who kissed *his hand with his mouth* while he was adoring the heavenly bodies, and to punish idolatry, as it was the denial and renunciation of the one true God.

But now let us suppose that this candid Divine, by *gross acts of Idolatry*, only meant *mere Idolatry* or Idolatry, as such, *Idolatry in the abstract*: And then the Reader is to consider his censure of the Bishop's principles as a mere stroke *ad invidiam*. The Bishop holds simple Idolatry to be the mere exercise of a *speculative Opinion only*: consequently, says the Doctor, an action without guilt of any kind. But the Bishop, who, I suppose, knows his own Principles best, and best understands their consequences, says No: for although a mere Idolater is not amenable to the tribunal of the civil Magistrate, because a mere speculative Opinion affects not the welfare of Society, yet it may affect the Owner of it, at a higher tribunal, because he may have embraced an erroneous opinion, derogatory to the honour of God, through Appetite, prejudice, inattention, or many other deviations from Reason, which make a free Being accountable to his Maker.—I humbly presume, therefore, that the Bishop's Principles on this head, though so severely censured by this rigid Divine, may be *no banter upon Reason and Common-sense*, but that it is very likely his Lordship was in earnest.

To say my mind, I believe the candid Doctor, by—*gross acts of Idolatry*—was willing to be understood either way, just as would best serve his virtuous purpose against the Author of the *Divine Legation*.

The Doctor sometimes speaks of *the Alliance between Church and State*. But *public utility* is the basis of this theory. Now that his Lordship should suppose *obscene rites, unnatural prostitutions, and human sacrifices*, to be consistent *with public utility*, may be affirmed by those who will affirm any thing, I mean his Lordship's Adversaries, but will be laughed at by every body else.

It should then be remembered, that all sorts of idolatrous worship, hurtful and injurious to Society by their licentious and debauched practices, have nothing to do in the present question: The Bishop, both in his *Alliance* and in his other works declaring an abhorrence of the least toleration to any of these.

But, in order to keep up the appearance of an argument, the Doctor found it necessary, first to venture on a bold and violent falsification of the Bishop's system, and to charge him with granting a toleration to every species of idolatry, even where it was most mischievous and detrimental to civil Society. And secondly, as necessary to cover and disguise the malignity of his own system, by pretending that he never denied a toleration to idolatry, but where civil society must suffer by it.

The Bishop, answering an objection of Lord Bolingbroke concerning *THE MODE of punishing idolatry* under the Law of Moses, said, " He [L. B.] should  
 " have considered that the law all along distinguishes  
 " between the crimes capable of legal conviction, and  
 " such as were inscrutable to all but omniscience.  
 " The latter God reserves for his own inquisition:  
 " but the crime in question was an *overt-act of ido-*  
 " *latrous*

“ *latrous worship*, and therefore came *reasonably* and  
 “ *equitably* before the civil tribunal \*.”

Here the Doctor objects, first, “ that the force  
 “ of this reasoning extends to every civil govern-  
 “ ment upon the face of the earth †.” If he means  
 that overt-acts of idolatrous worship are *capable of*  
*conviction* under every government, this will be rea-  
 dily allowed. But I must remind him that the pre-  
 sent question is only of such overt-acts of idola-  
 trous worship, as were not in any measure prejudicial  
 to the State. And though overt-acts of idolatry,  
 thus circumstanced, were capable of conviction un-  
 der every Government, yet they were no where pu-  
 nishable by the civil tribunal, but in Judea. For  
 there, overt-acts of *idolatrous worship* were overt-acts  
 of *high treason*: and every species of idolatry with-  
 out exception, coming under this denomination,  
 must have been justly liable to capital punishment.

But if overt-acts of idolatrous worship were ca-  
 pable of legal conviction, and might be brought be-  
 fore the civil tribunal in Judea; the Doctor asks,  
 secondly, how could the Bishop say that *idolatry is*  
*not amenable to civil justice*, or *that punishing for*  
*idolatry is punishing for* OPINIONS ‡? Why? does  
 he ask: For this plain reason, when the Bishop said  
 this, he was speaking not of Judea under a Theo-  
 cracy, but of the Doctor’s imaginary patriarchal go-  
 vernment; under which, overt acts of idolatry not  
 being *high treason* and having no civil influence on  
 morals, must have been exempted from the jurif-  
 diction of the magistrate. And if he had nothing

\* View of Lord Bolingbroke, third Edition, p. 187.

† P. 39.

‡ P. 38.



to do with these overt acts, he must have punished idolatry as *matter of opinion*, if he punished it at all.

Again, “ By the terms of the alliance, says the  
 “ Doctor, it appears, that the church has *a coercive*  
 “ *power* FOR THE REFORMATION OF MANNERS. If  
 “ it be asked, how the church came by it ; it is  
 “ answered, that the church received this power or  
 “ jurisdiction from the state. The State then was  
 “ originally possessed of this coercive power for the  
 “ reformation of manners, in as full and ample a  
 “ manner as the church enjoyed it afterwards ; or  
 “ how could the state make a grant of it to the  
 “ church ?——Certainly. Why then should the  
 “ State part with it. For some people may be in-  
 “ clined to think, that the State might as well have  
 “ kept it still in her own hands, and never have  
 “ made a grant of it to the church at all \*.”

The author of the Alliance, in the place here quoted, is speaking of some *peculiar* duties, useful to Society, which could not be conveniently enforced by civil laws, or coercive power in the hand of the magistrate †. Now if these duties could not be conveniently enforced by coercive power in the hands of the Magistrate, here is a good reason, why he should lend it to the church, to be employed *in his own service*, for a *reformation of manners*, which civil laws could not effectually reach. Instead there-

\* P. 43, 4.

† Among these are such of “ the duties of *perfect obligation*,  
 “ whose Breach is owing to the intemperance of the sensual ap-  
 “ peites. The severe prohibition of which threatens greater and  
 “ more enormous evils. For while these unruly passions over-  
 “ flow, the stopping them in one place is causing them to break  
 “ out with greater violence in another. As the rigorous pu-  
 “ nishment of fornication has been generally seen to give birth  
 “ to unnatural lusts.” Alliance, p. 95. 4th Edition.

fore,

fore of asking " why the State should make a grant  
 " of coercive power to the church for the promo-  
 " tion of this end," he should have shewn that civil  
 laws might effectually enforce the observance of the  
 duties above mentioned : And then he would have  
 done what he so rarely does, talked to the purpose.

If the Magistrate could have conveniently employed his coercive power for this end, the Bishop contends that it would not have been prudent to make a delegation of it to the church. This is the very doctrine of the Alliance. And yet the Doctor solemnly offers this (I do not know what to call it) as an objection to that doctrine.

If there be either God or Goddess presiding over Controversy, the first petition of every honest votary should be preferred in the words of the Spanish proverb, which the author of the Divine Legation has had frequent occasion to repeat. " GIVE ME" (I ask no more) " AN ADVERSARY THAT UNDER-  
 " STANDS ME."

The Doctor would justify Abraham in punishing idolatry, from the consideration of *his peculiar engagements to God, his particular situation and circumstances, the proneness and propensity of his family to idolatry, and the numerous temptations which were constantly alluring them to the practice of it* †.

The question (let the Reader remember, as the Doctor has done all he can to make him forget) only concerns such modes of idolatrous worship, as were in no degree mischievous and hurtful to Society. There

† P. 46, 7.

was then nothing to punish but *mere matter of opinion*, or a wrong and ill-informed judgment concerning the proper object of divine worship. But punishment for opinions is an infringement and violation of the rights of conscience. And this violation being in itself iniquitous and sinful, could not be justified by the particular situation and circumstances of Abraham and his family, how *singular* and *extraordinary* soever that situation might be.

As for his *peculiar engagements to God*,—these could not release him from the duty and obligations which he owed to his fellow creatures.

But as Abraham was raised up to preserve the worship of the true God, must it not have been his duty to check the progress of every species of idolatry, even where the interests of civil society were not in the least affected by it? Unquestionably it was. But I must beg leave to add, by *legitimate and proper means*, or the mild and gentle method of persuasion, exhortation, and instruction; not by *wholesome severities*. If any of his family apostatized from the worship of the true God, he might endeavour to reclaim them from their error, by informing and enlightening their understandings; by exposing the vanity and impuissance of idols; by teaching and explaining the nature and attributes of the one supreme God; by the assurance of his favour and protection while they adhered to his service; and by alarming them with the terrors of the divine vengeance, which would await their defection and revolt from him. If he could thus reform them by reason and argument, all was well; if not, he had nothing to do, but to leave them to God and their own consciences.

The



The Doctor seems to fancy, Abraham would not have been able to preserve the worship of the true God in his family, if he had not been intrusted with *coactive power* to extirpate idolatry. And hence he infers Abraham *must* have been intrusted with *coactive power* for this purpose. His reasoning would have been much more satisfactory, as well as more decent, if he had *first* shewn that Abraham was intrusted with *coactive power* for this purpose, and then had inferred that such Trust was *necessary* to maintain and uphold the worship of the one true God. As for myself, I find that the institution of penal laws against idolatry was reserved for a distant and future period, the time of the *Legation of Moses*. And hence I conclude they were *not necessary* in any preceding age of the world. For I shall not presume to dictate to the Supreme Cause of all things, or to enlighten and inform Omniscience, by pointing out and prescribing *the times and seasons*, when the institution of penal laws against idolatry would have been most expedient and useful.

But, without having recourse to this reasoning, we may see clearly (when prejudice and party do not blind us) that while the knowledge of God's name was to be kept up somewhere only in the world at large, there was small occasion for penal laws against idolatry; but when, by the overspreading of idolatry, this name was reduced to, and was to be preserved in, one particular nation, there might be then much occasion for these penal laws.

We read that Abraham was *called* to keep up and support the worship of the true God in his family. We find from the Scripture History, that he actually did so. But we do not find that he was  
commis-

commissioned to use, or that he ever did use, coercive power for this end. And yet, had INTOLERANCE been *the ordinance of Heaven*, we probably should have heard something of his *divine commission* to use it.

“ I know Abraham, that he will command his children, and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment \*.” Dr. Lowth lays great stress on this text †. Now it plainly relates to the *parental* care and instruction required of Abraham, *as father and master of a family*. It implies, that he should train and educate his children and family in the principles of true religion. But how does it evince that he was to hold them to the true worship *by force and compulsion*, after they were arrived at years of maturity, and capable of chusing a religion for themselves? On what grounds does the Doctor suppose, that *parental power* would authorize him to inflict *civil punishment* on any of his family, who should dissent from the worship embraced by himself?

It is the duty of every father and master of a family now, as well as it was Abraham's duty, then, “ to command his children and household to walk in the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment.” But have fathers and masters any power to restrain their household and children, arrived at years of discretion, to any particular scheme or system of religion, without their own consent? The Bishop had said, “ The usurped right of punishing for opinions, was first assumed and long ingrossed by Idolaters. And, if tradition may be believed, Abraham himself narrowly escaped the fire for preaching against its divinity.” Here again

\* Genesis, xviii. 19.

† P. 47.

the Doctor steps in, and says, " Let us see  
 " then what this tradition says; and let us have  
 " the whole of it; for your Lordship has re-  
 " ported it very imperfectly — The Arabic, Per-  
 " sic, and Jewish writers relate in particular, *that*  
 " *he threw down and brake to pieces the images, and*  
 " *burned the temples of the idolaters.* You seem to  
 " approve of Abraham's behaviour on this occa-  
 " sion, by representing him as suffering unjustly  
 " for it. — Now all this was while he was yet in  
 " Chaldea, a country *where idolatry was the esta-*  
 " *blished worship, himself a private person, and sub-*  
 " *ject to the laws of his country, and to his rightful*  
 " *Prince, yet, in opposition to all earthly authority, he*  
 " used his utmost endeavours to extirpate idola-  
 " try, and to introduce the true religion. And  
 " would you have the same Abraham, when free  
 " from these restraints, and ruling his own people,  
 " *sit still and supinely suffer the introduction of idol-*  
 " *worship into his own family, and among his own*  
 " *dependents?* All that I would require of him, is,  
 " that in this new situation, and under additional  
 " obligations of duty, he should exert equal zeal  
 " in the same cause, which he might now do with  
 " greater propriety; and as a governor, prevent  
 " the introduction of that false worship, from which  
 " even as a private man, he (according to the tra-  
 " dition cited by your Lordship) so *laudably and me-*  
 " *ritoriously,* interposed to reclaim his country-  
 " men \*."

This will deserve to be examined. The Bishop  
 chanced to say, That Abraham was so far from  
 being himself a Persecutor, that he had like to have  
 been burnt for a Heretic himself by the idolaters of



his own country, if *old tradition was to be believed*. He spoke with this reserve, because all *old tradition* has been sophisticated : and he had a right to separate what he thought genuine from the other. In doing this he went (in the case before us) on Principles; not capriciously, or (what is worse) merely to serve a turn. The whole of the Tradition in question is this, *That Abraham threw down and brake to pieces the images, and burned the Temples of the idolaters, for which he had like to have been cast into the fire*. The reasons why the Bishop rejected the former part of the Tradition, I suppose, were these :

1. Because the *Fire-worshippers* never had any *images* or idols.

2. Because this part of the story has, in the face of it, the standing mark of a commentitious addition. All that *old Tradition* generally did was only to deliver a *fact* ; and *after-Traditionalists* added the *reason*. So here, early evidence says, Abraham narrowly escaped the fire : later tradition says, it was for insulting the national worship.

3. The Bishop seems to have rejected this traditional *reason* as commentitious, because it contradicts every thing we learn of the character of Abraham in the sure records of sacred Writ : when we often find him sojourning in idolatrous cities, but never hear of any of his violations of the public peace, by insults on their religion and worship, how gross, ridiculous, or erroneous soever that worship was.

4. Because it stands on no better authority than the lying Legends of modern Orientalists, who propagated their Alcoran in the manner they represent Abraham

Abraham to have done; and apparently invented this fiction to support their own practices.

After this, could it be believed, that the Doctor should tell the Bishop that *he seemed to approve* this frantic behaviour, so absurdly ascribed to the Father of the Faithful! The Bishop has proved, in an irrefragable manner, the truth of the miracle in the destruction of the Temple against the attempts of Julian. But will the Doctor tell him, that therefore his Lordship *seems to approve* of all the lies that Philostorgius and Theophanes tell of this matter?—And if *written* history be thus liable to sophistication, what must *traditional*? But the Doctor takes it for granted, that if the Bishop espouses one part of the tradition, he was necessitated to espouse the other: and therefore, according to his ideas, the only question will be concerning the Bishop's *approbation* of the fact: and *approve* it he needs must, because he thinks it hard that Abraham should be brought to the stake for it. But here the Doctor's logic fails him: for by the same reasoning he might prove, that the Bishop *approves* of the numerous libels printed against him, because he may think it hard that every Libeller should be brought to the Pillory.

But if the *Bishop* does not *approve* this mad prank, impiously ascribed to Abraham, I know who does. Dr. *Lowth* says, it was a *laudable and meritorious* action. But who will thank him for this, except the followers of *Whitefield* and *Wesley*, I confess I cannot tell.

On the whole, the learned Doctor will either take all the *tradition* or none. In this he shews himself a craftsman in the trade. He makes Abraham first a *Zealot*, and then a *Persecutor*: for nothing is more certain, than that every *Zealot* would be a *Persecutor*, if he could.

However, if we will not suffer Abraham to be *both*, the Doctor cannot see what he has else to do but to *sit still and supinely suffer the introduction of idol worship in his own family, and amongst his own dependents*. We are apt to judge of a favourite character by ourselves. Abraham is not suffered to have his play things of fire and fagot; so he is in the dumps, and *sits still and supinely suffers idolatry to take its course, even in his own family*. But S. S. gives a much more reasonable account of Abraham's conduct. It represents him as watchful over his household, and setting his *dependents* an example of true zeal in the worship of the one only God: Yet so far from calling down *fire from heaven* on idolaters, that he solicits in favour of the very worst of all, *the idolatrous city of Sodom*.

The Doctor complains, that the Bishop “artfully “slides into the main argument the foreign term “*idolatrous*,” and assures us, “he can find no “place, where Sodom is charged with the crime “of Idolatry\*.” However, he does not advance far, before he finds a proper voucher of this fact. For he informs us, p. 46, that they were idolaters, and that their unnatural worship was the source of their unnatural vices. “He (Abraham) settled in “the southern parts of Palestine, where he was *sur-* “*rounded with idolatrous nations*; on one side the “Egyptians; on another, the Chaldæans; on a “third, the nearest of all, the *Canaanites*; of whose “*monstrous abominations, the concomitants and the* “*effects of their unnatural worship*, we cannot read “without astonishment.”—In a word, the Sodomites *were not idolaters*, because their being such makes Abraham a friend to Toleration. But they *were idolaters*, because this favours the Doctor's own *intolerant principles*.

\* P. 18. 24.



Before I quit the argument relating to Abraham, it may be proper to observe, his Lordship had said, "Hobbes is, I believe, the only one (save our professor) who holds that Abraham had a right to prescribe to his family what religion they should be of †." Here the Doctor complains of misrepresentation, and impotently labours to ward off the blow, by a distinction which he borrows of Mr. *Locke's Intolerant*, and which *intolerants* of all times have employed for the purpose to which the Doctor here applies it. "How is it, says he, that I and my friend Hobbes concur in sentiments so lovingly? I say that Abraham had a right to restrain his family from idolatry, from a species of false worship condemned by natural Religion, and productive of infinite corruptions, both religious and moral. Hobbes holds, that Abraham had a right *to prescribe to his family what religion they should be of*, i. e. whether true or false, for here is no limitation. So that it appears at last, that there is just as much difference between Hobbes and our Professor upon this point, as there is between a right of imposing upon another a false religion, and a right of restraining another from practices of a false religion in themselves immoral and sinful."

The Bishop said nothing of his *friendship* with Hobbes. But as there is, it seems, a friendship, and as *friendship* arises from similitude of sentiments, the good understanding between these two Professors of Malmesbury and Oxford is likely to continue. For where is the *difference* between saying, as Dr. Lowth does, that the Patriarchs could oblige their families to be of the true religion, and

† See the Appendix.

saying,

saying, as Dr. Hobbes does, that Abraham had a right to prescribe to his family what religion they should be of? Did Hobbes think it possible that Abraham should prescribe a false Religion to his Family, that is to say, a Religion different from his own? And was not his own Religion the true? So that true religion, or what the Magistrate calls or thinks so, is the same thing to the purpose of tolerance or intolerance. For why is the Magistrate intitled to exact conformity to *his own religion*, but because he thinks it *the true*.

Here again our Doctor pretends, that he would only give Abraham a right to restrain idolatry, when its rites and practices are immoral. But we have shewn that his argument requires him to extend the coercive power of the magistrate to *all sorts* of idolatry, without any regard to the particular nature and tendency of its rites and practices.

If any one Magistrate have a right to punish idolatry, *as the denial of the true God*, i. e. as matter of opinion; it will follow that the right of punishing for opinion must be essential to his office, and consequently must belong to every Magistrate in common. Every magistrate therefore will be commissioned to punish what *he holds* to be religious error, and to compel his subjects to embrace the religion which he supposes to be true.

So much for Abraham. We will now go on to consider the conduct and behaviour of Jacob. For his the Doctor produces as *an example*, which quite determines the question, and proves, the Patriarchs had a right to suppress idolatry by force and violence.

Jacob,

Jacob, going to celebrate a solemn act of divine worship, says to his family, " Put away your  
" strange Gods, and be clean, and change your garments."

" A command, says the Doctor, issued by a superior, in an authoritative manner, and in due form, plainly implies a right, and a power, and a will to enforce obedience to the command: the Patriarch issues a command against idolatry; therefore the Patriarch had a right and a power to PUNISH idolatry, and would have punished it in those whom he should have found guilty of the crime †."

It has already been remarked, that the Doctor's reasoning not only gives Jacob a right to punish those who refused to renounce and abjure their false Gods, but even all who neglected to *purify themselves and to change their garments*, or to conform to the rites and ceremonies of the public Worship. Could Hobbes himself have gone farther? Or had he been reduced like our Doctor, to invent and compile a PATRIARCHAL STATUTE-BOOK, what could he have done more than *inflict death* on those who did not conform to the established Religion?

I must observe, that Jacob (as was usual for fathers of families) was here exercising the office, and acting in the character, of PRIEST. *As such*, he was about to preside in a solemn act of religious worship, by the express order and direction of the Deity. *As such*, he was instructing and exhorting his household to prepare and qualify themselves for the due and proper performance of this



service, when he said, " Put away your strange  
 " Gods, be clean, and change your garments."  
 Since then he was acting in the character of *Priest*,  
 or minister of religion, and what he says was purely  
 relative to the qualifications necessary to prepare  
 them for an act of divine worship; it seems reason-  
 able to conclude, that these were *words of persua-*  
*sion and exhortation only*, and not *words of com-*  
*mand*, which could exact obedience by secular pu-  
 nishment.

Suppose an ancient Priest, or modern Minister,  
 under the authority with which they were invested,  
 should take (as they often have done) these words of  
 Jacob for their text,——does that imply they had  
 a right to administer fire and fagot? Are not such  
 words every day used as words of *persuasion* only,  
 without being supposed to denote any right to co-  
 active or coercive power in the Minister of religion,  
 who uses them? Has not the Doctor, addressing  
 himself to his congregation, often said, " Put away  
 " your sins, cease to do evil, learn to do well,"  
 without imagining himself intitled to inflict civil pu-  
 nishment on those who did not obey him?—The cause  
 of persecution must run very low, while such won-  
 derful reasoning is employed for its support.

But if the Doctor will have it, that this was a  
*word of command*, implying a right to punish diso-  
 bedience; let him look to the consequence. For  
 it will follow that the Ancient PRIEST, as such,  
 must have had a great and unbounded power. He  
 was not confined to *persuasion, instruction, and ex-*  
*hortation*. He was not only required to terrify and  
 alarm sinners, by holding forth the terrors of the di-  
 vine vengeance, but was authorized to inflict that  
 vengeance upon those, on whom his persuasion and  
 instruction

instruction had not a due influence. And if a *Priest* be armed with this plenitude of power, why need the Doctor have recourse to the *Magistrate*, who, if he obeys his call, must then only act in the high office of *executioner of the decrees of the church*?

The Doctor talks much of the *Patriarchal Church and State* \*; and he has contrived to keep the State in

\* In the 42d and 43d pages of his Pamphlet, he treats with much insolence and contempt the supposition of an *alliance between Church and State*, invented to settle and adjust the distinct rights and privileges of each Society, and to regulate all differences which may arise between them. Does he or does he not see, that, with the same reason, he might ridicule the supposition of an *original compact between King and People*, invented for the same uses.

If he hold the supposition of this alliance to be unwarrantable, because no such treaty was *formally* and *actually* executed, I must desire him to consider, what the patrons of civil liberty say, when they are told the original compact between King and People, is only a creature of the imagination, and are called upon to point out the *ancient records*, which contain the *original draught* of this contract. They hold it sufficient to reply, It is not so *imaginary*, but that the prerogatives of the Prince, and the privileges of the People, are to be regulated on the supposition of such a contract, and the conditions ascribed to it. And if it be the only legitimate and rightful foundation of the prerogatives of the one, and the privileges of the other, they say they need not concern themselves about its *formal* and *actual* execution. Its *virtual* execution is all which they contend for, and all which their argument requires them to maintain.

Now if the *virtual* execution of this *compact* is sufficient to remove all the objections raised against it, why may we not say the same of the *virtual* execution of the *alliance between Church and State*.

The great point, intended by the Author, was, to discriminate the nature and essence of the two Societies, to settle their bounds and limits, and to adjust the rights and privileges peculiar

in a proper degree of subordination and subjection to his Church.

The Doctor, perhaps, may say, he never intended to give these large and exorbitant powers to the Patri-

liar to each. And this, in order to prevent and guard against the mischiefs, which have so often arisen from the want of an exact discrimination and adjustment of these rights and privileges. If then his Adversaries would destroy the credit of this Theory, they should set themselves to shew, that it is not calculated to answer and promote the end proposed by him. They should prove, that *other terms and conditions of alliance, different from those prescribed in this Theory*, would be fitter to preserve harmony between the two Societies, and might be better adapted to regulate any differences with regard to their respective rights and prerogatives.—Or they should prove, that he has not accurately distinguished the nature and essence of the two Societies, and deduced and marked out the privileges, which belong and are peculiar to each. For if nothing of this can be objected, there will be the same necessity, for supposing an *alliance between Church and State*, as for supposing a *contract between Prince and People*.

Dr. Lowth, speaking of the *alliance between Church and State*, says, “Of which *convention*, though so famous, I dare say, “Mr. Locke never heard a word; for, if he had, he would “certainly have had something to say to it.” P. 43.

The Doctor is a bold man. Yet if *he* had not *dared* to say it, *I* should.—HOOKER, *before* Locke, had never heard a word of it, and his defence of *Ecclesiastical Policy* is just so much the worse for his ignorance, as the Doctor may see by what the Author of the *Alliance* has said on that subject \*. Lord BOLINGBROKE, *after* Locke, knew as little of it as our Doctor, even after he had *heard* of it, as may be seen by the *Appendix* to the *Alliance*; and if the Doctor be wise, some information, there given, may serve for Both of them.

But if Mr. Locke had heard of it (says our Doctor) *he would certainly have had something to say to it*. In this I heartily agree with him; for it was not Mr. Locke's way, as it is his, to rail at what he had nothing to say. Mr. Locke, 'tis very likely,

\* See the *Alliance*, B. II. C. 5.

would



Patriarchal Church. But what is this to me? It is not my business to examine how far he intended to carry his argument, but how far his argument will carry him, on the principles of logic and fair reasoning. If Jacob, *as Priest*, had a right to punish the infringers and non observers of these precepts, all the large and extensive powers of the church, just mentioned, will follow of course. If he

would have said, "As I hold the natural freedom and independency of man, I must necessarily suppose an *original compact* between Prince and People, before a legitimate Society could be formed; and holding too, as I have done, that Church and State are Societies of different natures, and consequently independent and sovereign, I must needs suppose that they entered into a free Convention before they could *ally*."

And this last supposition must be as reasonable as the first, unless you will say, with the *Erafsians*, that the Church is naturally subject to, dependent on, and a creature of, the State.

It has been said, this notion of her natural independence would rather obstruct, than promote, her *alliance* with the State. But has it not also been said, that the original independence of the people would rather obstruct, than promote, their accession to the *original compact*, which puts them in subjection to the Prince?

According to the Bishop's Theory, the Church, with all her natural independency, *unallied*, stands as much in need of the protection of the Magistrate, as the People would do before the institution of civil government. She must therefore have had the same motives and inducements to part with her independency, which they had to part with theirs.

As to the pretence, that this notion of her independency may tempt turbulent and ambitious Churchmen to shake off their subjection to the State; it will be best answered by observing, that the patrons of the *original compact* have been reproached by the followers of Filmer, with furnishing factious and seditious Demagogues, with a plausible pretext to disturb the public peace and quiet. But what man of sense ever gave them credit?

was to punish them, *as civil Sovereign*, it will follow, that the civil Sovereign or magistrate is the tool and instrument of the church.

Whether he inflicts this punishment as *Priest* or *Magistrate*, here will be a full sanction for all the practice of INTOLERANCE. For it will follow, that either *Priest* or *Magistrate* must have been impowered not only to compel men, by force and violence, to worship the true God, but even to exact conformity to the *rites and ceremonies* of the public worship.

Part of Jacob's family were slaves, whom his sons had led away captive after the bloody and inhuman massacre of the Sechemites. These must have been reduced to the most ignominious and cruel state of servitude, if they were either to receive a new religion at the nod of their new Lord and Master, or to suffer for their contumacy and non-compliance.

Jacob says to his family, " Put away the strange Gods from among you." He was then apprized that they worshipped strange Gods, or that they were guilty of idolatry. And yet we do not find him acting in the character of *Judge* or *Magistrate*, i. e. punishing the offenders. — Here our Doctor exclaims, " punishing, my Lord! For what, I beseech you? for *putting away* the strange gods, " as they were commanded to do \*?" No, Sir; but for *taking* them without his leave, though not without his knowledge, as appears from the admonition here given. The thief may be ready to restore his stolen goods, and the rebel to lay down his

\* P. 32.

arms; but will this exempt them from the punishment of the past? Has the *Judge* or *Magistrate*, appointed by law to punish thieves and rebels, nothing to do but to pardon, on the promise that they will be thieves and rebels no more? Had Jacob been as deeply read in the PATRIARCHAL STATUTE-BOOK, as Dr. Lowth and his Jewish Lawyers; he could not but have known that *the duty of his office* called upon him to exercise justice on past crimes, as well as on the obstinate adherence to them.

Had Jacob looked upon *idolatry* as an *iniquity* not to be tolerated by the *Judge*, 'tis not to be conceived he would have permitted his family to retain, and to keep possession of, their strange Gods so long, and not have attempted a reformation till he was summoned to appear *before God in a solemn act of religious worship*.

In order to shew that the Patriarchs were not intolerant zealots, who looked on idolatry as an *iniquity to be punished by the Judge*, his Lordship takes notice, that “ Rachel stole her father’s Gods, with  
 “ a design to worship them. Now her idolatrous  
 “ worship, from its nature, could not be long hid.  
 “ The silence therefore of Scripture shews it to have  
 “ been *coram non judice*. So far was Rachel from  
 “ being doomed to the fire, that we do not find  
 “ even her Gods underwent this punishment.”

The Doctor, 1st, charges the Bishop with gratuitously and erroneously supposing, that Rachel stole her father’s Gods with an intention to *worship* them. What was it then? To *eat* them? Whatever  
 “ it was, he says, it was not to *worship* them, not only  
 “ because Jacob, according to the Bishop’s own ob-  
 “ servation,



was to punish them, *as civil Sovereign*, it will follow, that the civil Sovereign or magistrate is the tool and instrument of the church.

Whether he inflicts this punishment as *Priest* or *Magistrate*, here will be a full sanction for all the practice of INTOLERANCE. For it will follow, that either *Priest* or *Magistrate* must have been impowered not only to compel men, by force and violence, to worship the true God, but even to exact conformity to the *rites and ceremonies* of the public worship.

Part of Jacob's family were slaves, whom his sons had led away captive after the bloody and inhuman massacre of the Sechemites. These must have been reduced to the most ignominious and cruel state of servitude, if they were either to receive a new religion at the nod of their new Lord and Master, or to suffer for their contumacy and non-compliance.

Jacob says to his family, "Put away the strange Gods from among you." He was then apprized that they worshipped strange Gods, or that they were guilty of idolatry. And yet we do not find him acting in the character of *Judge* or *Magistrate*, i. e. punishing the offenders.—Here our Doctor exclaims, "punishing, my Lord! For what, I beseech you? for *putting away* the strange gods, "as they were commanded to do-<sup>\*</sup>?" No, Sir; but for *taking* them without his leave, though not without his knowledge, as appears from the admonition here given. The thief may be ready to restore his stolen goods, and the rebel to lay down his

\* P. 32.

arms; but will this exempt them from the punishment of the past? Has the *Judge* or *Magistrate*, appointed by law to punish thieves and rebels, nothing to do but to pardon, on the promise that they will be thieves and rebels no more? Had Jacob been as deeply read in the PATRIARCHAL STATUTE-BOOK, as Dr. Lowth and his Jewish Lawyers; he could not but have known that *the duty of his office* called upon him to exercise justice on past crimes, as well as on the obstinate adherence to them.

Had Jacob looked upon *idolatry* as an *iniquity* not to be tolerated by the *Judge*, 'tis not to be conceived he would have permitted his family to retain, and to keep possession of, their strange Gods so long, and not have attempted a reformation till he was summoned to appear *before God in a solemn act of religious worship*.

In order to shew that the Patriarchs were not intolerant zealots, who looked on idolatry as an *iniquity to be punished by the Judge*, his Lordship takes notice, that “ Rachel stole her father's Gods, with  
“ a design to worship them. Now her idolatrous  
“ worship, from its nature, could not be long hid.  
“ The silence therefore of Scripture shews it to have  
“ been *coram non judice*. So far was Rachel from  
“ being doomed to the fire, that we do not find  
“ even her Gods underwent this punishment.”

The Doctor, 1st, charges the Bishop with gratuitously and erroneously supposing, that Rachel stole her father's Gods with an intention to *worship* them. What was it then? To *eat* them? Whatever  
“ it was, he says, it was not to *worship* them, not only  
“ because Jacob, according to the Bishop's own ob-  
“ servation,

“ *servation, took care to instruct his wives in the true religion*, but also because it plainly appears from the preceding chapter, that Rachel, in particular, was a *serious and faithful* worshipper of Jehovah, the true and only God : *a strong presumption* at least in her favour, that she was not at this time addicted to any idolatrous practices\*.”

I shall readily allow that Rachel was a worshipper of the one Supreme God, and instructed in the true religion. So too undoubtedly were the rest of Jacob's family. But that they were not *serious and faithful* worshippers, adhering to the one true God *only*, appears from the admonition, “ to put away their strange Gods.” The Israelites in the times of the Judges, were better and much more fully instructed than Rachel in the exclusive worship of the true God, yet they worshipped idols along with the God of Israel. *A stronger presumption*, that the Professor knows little of the genius of ancient Times.

Some Interpreters suppose that Rachel stole her father's Gods, that he might not have their *Oracle* to apply to, to discover which way the fugitives went. If this were the case, though she did not worship them, at least she thought them worthy of worship, by the service she thought them capable of performing to the Owner. Besides the Doctor (who is ignorant of nothing) need not be told, that the ancient idolaters held that their *Gods and Slaves* had this in common, that they were always ready to serve those who had got possession of them.—Either way it is enough to shew, *how serious and faithful a worshipper she was*.

\* P. 28.



The Doctor says, 2dly, Rachel was never proved guilty of idolatry \*. The Author of the Divine Legation, indeed, takes it for granted that she was guilty of idolatry, and that, from the nature of the guilt, it could not be long a secret. And that he judged right, appears from Jacob's admonition to his family, "to put away their strange gods."

The Doctor tells us, "it is sufficient for his purpose, that the Patriarchs assumed, and exercised the power of punishing false worship, notwithstanding they might go too far, or exceed their commission in so doing." To this I hold it sufficient to reply, he neither has, nor can prove, that they ever assumed and exercised the power of punishing idolatry at all.

I shall close this argument with some observations on the punishment of idolatry by the Jewish law. UNBELIEVERS and INTOLERANT BELIEVERS have both tried to make their advantage of this part of the Mosaic institution. The One use it as an argument against the Divinity of the Jewish religion, on presumption that such laws, viz. the punishing for opinion, is contrary to natural equity. And the Other bring it to defend their intolerant principles, *by the example of heaven itself.*

Mr. Locke and the Bishop would justify the law by saying, idolaters were punished as *traitors* and *rebels*, guilty of no less a crime than *lese Majesty*. For under a THEOCRACY, the sole and exclusive adoration of the one true God is part of the *allegiance* which the Subject owes to the supreme Magistrate. On this idea, the objection of the *Deists*

\* P. 30.

has no force, since idolaters were not punished for matters of opinion, but for overt-acts of high treason. And on this idea, *Intolerants* can derive no right, from the authority of the Mosaic law, to punish for opinions, since it never punished on this score.

The Bishop, speaking of this law, says, it was punishing the rebellion of those who had chosen the Government under which they lived, when freely proposed to them. To this the defender of the *common rights of subjects* might object, that these laws were unjust, because no contract to give up the rights of conscience can be binding: for that the rejection of the law, the desertion of the worship of the one true God, and the commission of idolatry, might, some time, prove *matter of conscience* to the Jews, or such an action as they thought they were obliged in duty to perform.

“ To this, says his Lordship, I reply, with a  
 “ plain and decisive fact, That none of all the ido-  
 “ latrous worship the Jews ever fell into, from the  
 “ time of giving the law to the total dissolution of  
 “ the Republic, was MATTER OF CONSCIENCE;  
 “ but always of *convenience*; such as procuring  
 “ some temporal good, which they wanted or pre-  
 “ tended to want, or else the averting of some tem-  
 “ poral evil which they feared. The truth of which  
 “ appears from hence, that, in the midst of all  
 “ their idolatries, the God of their fathers was  
 “ ever owned to be the Creator and first Cause  
 “ of all things; and the religion taught by Moses,  
 “ to be a Revelation from Heaven \*.”

\* Divine Legation, vol. iv. p. 165.

To this the Doctor answers, " You call that a  
 " *plain fact*, which is not a *fact*, but a mere empty  
 " *speculation*, and so far from *plain*, that it is nei-  
 " ther at first sight probable, nor in its nature ca-  
 " pable of proof: you take upon you *peremptorily*  
 " to *decide* a question, which can be *decided* by no  
 " one, but God alone; and your asserting, without  
 " any authority, *that God foreknew that the case*  
 " *would not happen*, is only one more LARGE STRIDE  
 " IN PRESUMPTION \*."

The *fact*, which his Lordship has thus groundless-  
 ly, *temerariouſly*, and *presumptuouſly* ventured to assert,  
 is, " That none of the idolatrous worship which  
 the Jews ever fell into, was matter of conscience,"  
 or such as they thought they were in duty obliged  
 to perform. This he infers from hence, that, in  
 the midst of all their idolatries, the God of their fa-  
 thers was ever owned to be the Creator and first  
 cause of all things; and the religion taught by  
 Moses, to be a Revelation from Heaven. And  
 while this persuasion remained, how was it possible  
 that the commission of idolatry, i. e. the violation  
 of a law which they held to be a law of God, could  
 be matter of Conscience, or such an action as they  
 held themselves obliged in duty to perform?

The fact then to be disproved by the Doctor,  
 is, *That the Jews, when they relapsed into idolatry,*  
*continued to own the God of their fathers for the Crea-*  
*tor and supreme cause of all things, and did not re-*  
*ject the Mosaic religion AS A FALSE PRETENCE TO*  
 REVELATION. Now this is so far from being an  
 empty speculation, that it is confirmed by the direct

\* P. 40.



and express testimony of Scripture\*. And where is the temerity in asserting the reality of a fact, which is *peremptorily decided* by the testimony of the holy oracles? Or what LARGE STRIDE IN PRESUMPTION is it, to suppose God foreknew a circumstance which actually happened, i. e. to suppose *prescience* to be one of the divine attributes?

Having seen how successful he is in his attacks on the Bishop's solution, let us next examine, whether he be more so in removing the objection of the Deists to the Jewish Law, which punishes apostates with death; without taking in the notion of a Theocracy or supposing they were considered as guilty of *high treason*. He discards and derides the solution which Mr. Locke and the Bishop build on this Doctrine, as not affording a competent and *adequate* solution of the difficulties raised against this branch of the Mosaic institutes. It is then to be hoped he is prepared to repel this objection of the Deists with more vigour and efficacy than these his puny predecessors. But let him have a fair hearing.

He lays it down as a principle, "That the Magistrate is only commissioned to punish idolatry *so far as it has a pernicious effect on society.*" The Deists will condescend to argue with him on this principle, though he has so often shewn that he takes it up and lays it down as exigencies require. For on this very principle they arraign the law of iniquity and injustice, as extending its prohibitions and punishments much farther, than any civil constitution, founded on legitimate and rightful principles, ought to do. For, according to this maxim, every such constitution ought to dis-

\* Divine Legation, vol. iv. p. 193, &c.

tinguish between the idolatrous rites, which, by their immoral nature, are *injurious* to society, and those, which by their innocence in this respect, are *CIVILLY innoxious*. The first are the proper objects of legal punishment, the second, like other actions *civilly* indifferent, do not come within the province of the magistrate. But no such discrimination is made by the Mosaic law. It punishes idolatry in the lump; every overt-act of false worship without exception; not only obscene and impure rites, human sacrifices, and unnatural prostitutions, but even *the kissing the hand with the mouth* in the adoration of the sun and moon. Again; if idolatry were to be punished by the Magistrate *on account of the pernicious effect it had on society*, they will say, the law should have proportioned and adjusted its punishments of the several sorts of idolatry, according to the various tendency they had to vitiate and deprave the morals of their followers. Instead of this, we find it made no distinction, but subjected all idolaters, without exception, to *capital* punishment. The idolater just mentioned, *who barely kissed his hand with his mouth* in reverence of the sun and moon, was to suffer death, as much as if he had been guilty of murder and unnatural prostitution, or practices not only shocking to humanity, but even destructive to the human race.

The Deists then will tell the Doctor, 1st, That the law contradicted the principles of natural equity and justice, in punishing all sorts of idolatrous worship, even where Society had nothing to fear from it. 2dly, In punishing it with the same rigour and severity where it did no hurt, as where it was most detrimental to the State.

However, this promiscuous and indiscriminate punishment of idolatry will appear to be perfectly just and equitable, if we take in the principle of the *Theocracy*. Every species of idolatry, without exception, withdrawing from the *supreme Magistrate* the *allegiance* which was due to him, must have been the crime of *lese Majesty*: consequently every species of idolatry, without exception, must have been liable to *capital* punishment.

It is pleasant and curious to observe, the SPIRIT OF CONTRADICTION, in all its appearances under the management of so able a master. The Doctor will not allow the Bishop to vindicate the punishment of idolatry as high treason, *under a Theocracy*; and yet will vindicate the punishment of it as high treason, under a government *which was not Theocratical*. For he gives his Patriarchal Magistrate a right to punish it as REBELLION.

Exclude the notion of a Theocracy, and idolatry will be on the same footing in Judæa, as in all other countries. Where it hurts civil society, by being subversive and destructive of morality, it is punishable by the civil Tribunal in every system of Government. Where it is productive of no mischief to Society, the Magistrate had no more to do with it in Judæa, than in other places.

If Dr. Lowth will say, the Magistrate in Judæa might punish idolatry universally, or in all possible cases and circumstances, it must have been punished as matter of opinion. And then the objection of the Deists to the natural justice and equity of the law will remain in its full force. For it is allowed on all hands, that punishment for mere opinion is unjust. The Intolerants also will no longer be debarred the  
use



use they make of this circumstance, that is the assuming a right to punish for opinions, *in imitation of the Jewish law.*

If the law might punish *all sorts* of idolatry, because *some* are hurtful to the state; the Intolerant will ask, why *he* may not enact penal laws against all religious error, since *some* species's of it are confessedly and apparently injurious to Society.

Some writers of credit and distinction have laboured to clear the Mosaic law from the opprobrium of punishing for opinion, without the aid of *the Theocratic principle.* But it has been labour in vain. They say, *the civil polity* of the Jews was erected for the preservation of the worship of the true God, and the suppression of Polytheism and idolatry. The fundamental laws of the state, therefore, must have prohibited and punished all sorts of idolatry without distinction. Under such a civil polity, we are told by Dr. Leland, that "punishments were not inflicted for matters of *opinion*, but of *practice*, for open acts of idolatry, in subversion of the fundamental constitution of their state \*."

Here he takes for granted the justice and equity of a civil polity, constituted for the preservation of the worship of the one true God, and the extirpation of idolatry. But this is taking for granted the great point, which his argument required him to prove.

A *civil polity*, created for ends and purposes purely religious, seems to be as gross a solecism, as an

\* Leland's View of the Deistical Writers, vol. ii. p. 445.

*Ecclesiastical polity*, instituted for the maintenance and support of things merely temporal.

On this supposition, a *civil* Society is formed for a *religious* end. Thus civil and religious societies must have the same destination, end, and object. They must then employ and make use of the same *means*, and consequently must have the *same nature and essence*. Thus, instead of being specifically and essentially different, they will be one and the same.

If the *civil* (in contradistinction to the *religious*) constitution of the Jews, might be so far different from other civil constitutions, as to have a different end and object, it will follow, that civil Societies, in different ages and periods of the world, have been *specifically* and *essentially* different from each other. With just the same good sense, Dr. Leland might suppose an essential difference between creatures of the same species.

But these writers would screen the law from the imputation of punishing for opinions, by saying, idolatry was considered as treason against the *State* or *civil community*. Dr. Foster tells us, “ Idolatry “ was punished as *high treason* against the *State*, “ and not against the Person and Majesty of the “ King of the Jews \*.” Dr. Leland says, “ Under such a constitution, to revolt to idolatry and “ Polytheism, was in the most criminal sense to be “ TRAITORS to the community †.”

Now if they will not allow, that it was *high treason* against the King, they will be unable to prove

\* Sermons, vol. iii. p. 375.

† Vol. ii. p. 454. View of the Deistical Writers.

that it was *high treason* at all. For how can there be *high treason* in a legitimate and well-constituted government, against any but the MAGISTRATE?

In a time, when every thing was running into confusion, a bad despotic Minister was justly *condemned*. But the rage of his enemies being no otherwise to be allayed but with his blood, they invented the jargon of *high treason against the State*. A wicked expedient to blanch a Murder, which hath been execrated from that time to this. And with great reason. High treason against the Supreme Power, let the form of government be what it will, may be easily defined and ascertained, and so is the proper object of law. But high treason against the State or Constitution is so vague a Phantom, that every man creates it for himself, and then makes it his Idol. From so intolerable a mischief all free states, and all governments founded on the principles of liberty have secured the subject, by making nothing high treason, but attempts against the supreme magistrate. It was not possible for God himself to make *Idolatry* high treason in any form of government, in which he himself was not King; because it could not be done without transferring to another the divine honour and adoration, which were due only to himself.

Upon the whole, the author of the book of Job was speaking of a *political* or *civil* constitution, which prescribed the exclusive worship of the one true God, and punished idolatry, as such, or merely as it was the renunciation of this worship. But this universal and undistinguishing punishment of idolatry would not be just and equitable in any political and civil government but in the Jewish Theocracy. I must conclude therefore, with Mr. Locke and the Bishop of Gloucester, that the Author of this book had his eye on the Mosaic Law.

We



We will consider next, the famous question of *the punishment of children for the sins of their parents*.—In the Mosaic Law, God declares he will punish the sins of the fathers upon their children. “I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me\*.” But, then Jeremiah and Ezekiel declared that this mode of punishment was to cease after the promulgation of the Gospel†. Now as it was to cease with the Law, it must have been peculiar and appropriated to that system, and not a mode of punishment made use of in the world at large, in the *general* exercise and administration of divine Providence. For the mode of punishment made use of in the world at large, in the *general* exercise and administration of divine Providence, must have been just the same before and after the publication of the Christian Religion.

These things being premised, I now come directly to the point. Job, in the book going

\* Exod. xx. v. 34, 7.

† “In *these* days they shall say no more, the fathers have eaten a sour grape, and the children’s teeth are set on edge; but every one shall die for his own iniquity, every man that eateth the sour grape, his teeth shall be set on edge. Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a NEW COVENANT with the house of Israel; NOT according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt, &c.” Jeremiah xxxi. 20—33.

“What mean ye, that you use this proverb concerning the land of Israel, saying, The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children’s teeth are set on edge? As I live, saith the Lord God, ye shall not have occasion any more to use this proverb in Israel. Behold all souls are mine, as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine: *the soul that sinneth, it shall die.* Ezekiel xviii. 2—4.

under

under his name, speaking of the wicked, says, "The eyes of his children shall fail." Again, "God layeth up iniquity for his children \*." Now Job is represented in all this Book as a worshipper of the *one true God*, and well acquainted with the several revelations of his will, and dispensations of his providence, to mankind. There can then be no question, but that in these texts he refers us to some Revelation, or divine Dispensation, in which the *one supreme God* had threatened to punish the children for the sins of their forefathers. It should seem therefore he referred to the MOSAIC LAW, since this mode of punishment was peculiar to that part of the revealed system, and the *extraordinary providence* by which it was administered.

Accordingly it was asked, "*Where did God ever declare, That he would use this particular mode of punishment but in the Jewish Law.*"† To this, Dr. Lowth replies, "whether God ever declared it, or not; or whether the opinion, that God would use this mode of punishment, be in its nature capable of being made a part of any civil Constitution beside that of the Jews, or not, yet this opinion may have prevailed in every nation under heaven; which is FULLY SUFFICIENT TO DESTROY YOUR ARGUMENT. That the sentiment occurring in Job, *that God layeth up the father's iniquity for his children*, is no proof that the poem must have been written by a Jew, I shewed by producing the same sentiment from Horace. For if that sentiment proves, that the poem of Job was written by a Jew; the same sentiment proves, that the ode of Horace was written by a Jew; and

\* P. 17, 5. 21, 19.

† Examination of Sherlock, p. 164.

“ that another ode, commonly also supposed of the  
 “ same poet, in which the same sentiment likewise  
 “ occurs, was also written by a Jew. In truth, the  
 “ sentiment in question (whether founded on experi-  
 “ ence, or reason, or revelation, whether true or  
 “ false, it matters not to our purpose) is a popular  
 “ opinion, common to all nations, and all ages of  
 “ the world \*.”

“ By the same rule (says the Doctor) that you  
 “ conclude, the Author of the book of Job was a  
 “ Jew, you may prove HORACE to be a Jew.”  
 Now the rule by which his Lordship proves the  
 Author of the book of Job to be a Jew, is this.—  
 The Writer is confessed, both by the Doctor and  
 the Bishop, to be INSPIRED. An *inspired* Writer  
 can say nothing but the truth. But it was not true  
 that this mode of punishment prevailed any where  
 but amongst the Jews. Now let the Doctor apply  
 this rule to *Horace* and see whether it will fit.

“ But it matters not, (he says) whether the opi-  
 “ nion was true or false.” What? is it of no con-  
 sequence whether an *inspired* Writer lies or speaks  
 truth? Would such a one sanctify a falsehood by a  
 solemn affirmation; and then introduce the Al-  
 mighty himself declaring, that Job had said of him  
*the thing that was right?* *Horace* might take a po-  
 pular Opinion, whether true or false, to ornament  
 an Ode; but I hitherto understood that a Writer  
 speaking from God was allowed no such indulgence.

Yet I much question whether our Doctor ever  
 wrote any thing with more confidence and com-  
 placency, than when he said, that “ *it matters not*

\* P. 98, 99.



“to the purpose, whether this opinion was true or false.”——But there is something more to be learnt from the Bible than the rules of HEBREW POETRY.

If then an *inspired* writer talks of God's *laying up the iniquities of the fathers for the children*, he must refer to the Jewish Law, because he must have known that the fact was not true under any other dispensation of Providence. Observation and experience of what passes amongst mankind, plainly shews that in God's *general* moral government children are not *punished in the strict and proper sense of the word*, for the crimes of their parents.——That such a mode of punishment in the world at large is contrary to our ideas of the divine justice, is evident to all that have any such ideas.

The Doctor says, it matters not to his purpose, “whether this opinion was founded on *experience*, “*reason*, or *revelation*.” What was either *for*, or in, *his purpose*, I know not. This I know, that it was much for the Bishop's purpose, to shew, that the observation was not founded in mere popular opinion (which he does by the allowance that the Author of the book of Job was an *inspired* Writer) otherwise his Lordship's argument to prove him a Jew, from teaching this doctrine, could have no force. On the other hand, if it were founded on *revelation*, Ezekiel, Jeremiah, and the nature and reason of the thing, informs us, that it could be founded only on the MOSAIC LAW. And then the Bishop's argument will be fully established. It appears therefore, that the Doctor, with all his sufficiency; did not so much as know what was, and what was not, *to the purpose of this argument*.

After this, one may leave him to contemplate the figure he makes with his bravado, “to prove, that “half the writings of the Greeks and Romans were “written by Jews, *by the same argument*, by which “the Bishop has shewn that Job was written by a “Jew\*.” He supposes the *argument* infers, the Author of the book of Job must have been a Jew, *barely because he teaches a doctrine contained in the law*. Now his Lordship’s inference is not founded *barely on his teaching one of the doctrines of the law*, but on the *peculiar character* of the Author, and the particular *nature and circumstances* of the Doctrine, which was *true* with regard to the dispensations of providence over the Jews, but *false* with regard to its dispensations in the world at large. For his character of an inspired writer will not permit us to believe that he was speaking of God’s *general* moral government, under which his assertion was *false*, but only of his peculiar dispensation over the Jews, under which it was *true*.

But, these *Greek and Roman Writers*—Were they, under the same restraint, of delivering nothing, but the truth? were they *also amongst the Prophets*?

But now with regard to his authorities to prove, that the *punishment of Children for the sins of their parents* was a current opinion amongst the ancient pagans.

When he was called upon to point out a Religion, in which *the true God* had denounced this mode of punishment; it was a *Religion*, from which the author of the book of Job must be supposed to have learned this doctrine. On the Doctor’s hypothesis, there-

fore, that this Author lived before the giving of the LAW, it was his business to point out some *divine revelation*, anterior to this period, which taught the doctrine in question. Instead of this, he puts us off with passages from *Sophocles*, *Euripides*, and *Horace*, which inform us, that the *false deities* of the pagan world were believed to exercise this mode of punishment. But first of all, his authorities are of much too late a date to prove, that even *the false Deities of the Pagans* were believed to use this mode of punishment, during the period in question, or before the institution of the Mosaic Law. He concludes therefore very ridiculously, when he infers from these testimonies, “ that it was a popular opinion, “ common to all nations, and *all ages*, of the world.” Secondly, Had he shewn that it prevailed and obtained among the Pagans in this early period; and that they believed this mode of punishment was *agreeable to the nature and attributes of their false deities*; does it follow, that so wise and good a man, and so serious and faithful a worshipper of the true God, as Job, must have believed, it was *agreeable to the nature and attributes of the Supreme Cause of all Things*. Thirdly, had these later pagans spoken of the *Supreme Cause*, and said that he *punished the crimes of parents upon their children*, the question then would be, how this opinion came originally into the heathen world. Now it is almost self-evident that they could not have it from *reason*, or *experience*. They must have had it, therefore, from *revelation*. And if so, they must have had it from the *Mosaic Law*; since it did not belong to any other part of the *revealed system*.

To conclude. It has been shewn, that the Doctor will be unable to disculpate himself from the Charge of maintaining the principle of PERSECUTION,



tion, without saying he did not give the patriarchal Magistrate a power to punish Idolatry; *as it was* THE DENIAL OF THE ONE SUPREME GOD, or while it was considered only as *a speculative and religious error*. Yet to say this, would be saying, he never applied the passage in Job to the patriarchal Magistrate, and never talked of the PATRIARCHAL STATUTE-BOOK so often mentioned. And, perhaps, he may venture to say all this. He may do it with as much truth, as when he pretends that *the comparison to Father Harduin* was not aimed and levelled at the Bishop. His own words convict him of prevarication. “ Verum poetæ semibarbaro post captivitatem Babylonicam scribenti tantam subtilitatem ut concedam, a me impetrare non possum. Porro autem stylus poematis, quod vel maximum est, præcipue vetustatem sapit; est ejus peculiaris character ἀρχαϊσμος. Adeo ut qui id infra captivitatem Babylonicam DEPRIMUNT, non multo sanius in Hebraicis judicare VIDEANTUR, quam in Latinis Harduinus; qui aurea Virgilii, Horatii, cæterorumque poemata ferreis monachorum sæculis adscripsit \*.”

He does not, you see, confine *his comparison* to any one particular person *in nubibus*; but, speaking *in the plural number*, extends it indiscriminately to *all those*, who give to the book of Job the late date which so much disgusts the delicate taste of our fastidious Doctor; and consequently, must include his Lordship. That he intended to include the Bishop, appears from the following words of his Letter, “ My  
“ Lord, you mistake me; you will perpetually appropriate to yourself in particular, what I say in

\* Supplementum ad primam Prælectionum Editionem: Addit. Editionis secundæ, p. 312.

“ general. — I did not confine myself to your hypothesis: I was speaking of those authors in general, who place the book of Job below the Babylonish captivity.” P. 77.

One word more ere I conclude. The second part of the *Epistulary Correspondence* (which I have the Bishop's leave to annex to these pages) shew by the unerring evidence of dates, that the Doctor was the aggressor and began the quarrel. With what spirit he began it, appears from his insolent and injurious comparison to *Father Harduin*. Yet this gross and glaring indignity extorted nothing more from his Lordship than a little raillery. He preferred this gentler mark of sensibility to *serious expostulation*, when he was exposing arguments that tended to establish INTOLERANCE AND CIVIL SLAVERY. *Serious expostulation* might have had consequences, which the Bishop is the last man to countenance or approve. This is all the Doctor can object to the Person he had offended. For that no unfair or injurious representation of the Doctor's reasoning and opinions was laid before the Public in the *Appendix*, is here abundantly evinced.

T A N T U M.

T H E





THE  
SECOND PART  
OF AN  
EPISTOLARY CORRESPONDENCE  
BETWEEN THE  
Bishop of GLOUCESTER  
AND THE  
Late Professor of OXFORD,  
WITHOUT AN IMPRIMATUR

i. e. without a cover to the violated laws of honour  
and society.

---

—De homine nihil dixi. Itaque hodie perficiam—Litteras, quas me sibi misisse diceret, recitavit, homo & humanitatis expers, et vitæ communis ignarus. Quis enim unquam, qui paulum modo bonorum consuetudinem nosset, Litteras ad se ab amico missas, OFFENSIONE ALIQUA INTERPOSITA, in medium protulit, palamque recitavit? Quid est aliud TOLLERE E VITA VITÆ SOCIETATEM, quam tollere amicorum colloquia absentium?—Sit hoc humanitatis tuæ: Stultitiam incredibilem videte.

*Cic. in Antonium, Phillip. II.*

THE

SECOND PART

OF

THE HISTORY OF THE

REIGN OF

CHARLES THE FIRST

BY

JOHN BURNET

IN TWO VOLUMES

LONDON

Printed by J. Sturges, at the Press of the University of Oxford, in the Strand, near the Temple Church, in the Year 1704.

---

THE  
SECOND PART  
OF AN  
EPISTOLARY CORRESPONDENCE.

---

LETTER I.  
TO THE PROFESSOR.

P. P. Nov. 21, 1765.

Rev. Sir,

I DO not know whether the Prudent will excuse me for venturing another *Letter* to you, after you had so grossly violated the most respected laws of society, in publishing my private Letters to you without my knowlege or consent. In which proceeding I shall never make reprisals, (though I have your example) not so much as to bring my Superiors into the quarrel.

But if I want some degree of prudence in *writing* to you now, you seem to have wanted much more in *publishing* what I wrote before. For by those Letters the Public will see (if they have no better business than to attend to this idle squabble) that I was very desirous of peace, and had great good-will towards you; and (if they attend to

M 2 dates)



dates \*) they may see it was you who broke this reconciliation: For, I think, the *Latin Note* to the new edition of your *Lectures* (in which I am grossly insulted) was published before the English *Appendix to the Divine Legation*.

I have neither read nor seen, nor, I believe, ever shall, your *printed Letter* to me: Not out of contempt of you, but respect to myself.

*Falsus honor juvat, et mendax infamia terret :  
Quem ? —*

Not me (I assure you) who am neither false to myself nor others.

*I am, &c.*

W. GLOUCESTER.

\* The conciliating Letters passed in the year 1756.— Dr. Lowth's injurious *Note*, reflecting on the *Bishop*, was printed in the year 1764.— and the *Bishop's Postscript*, in answer to it, in 1765. This is a clear and short account of the matter: But the *Bishop* was to be made the Aggressor. How was this to be brought about? By a very extraordinary fetch of wit.—In this unlucky year, 1756, an acquaintance of the Bishop's *Examined Bishop Sherlock's Sermons*, in which the Doctor's opinion of the age of Job was controverted by a quotation from the book itself. But now unluckily again, the *Examination* was published some months before the correspondence began.—What then? Might not a *Convention* be broken before it was made, as well as an *Idolater* be punished by the judge before the office was created?

L E T-

## LETTER II.

## TO THE BISHOP.

Bath, Dec. 1, 1765.

My Lord,

I HAVE just now received your Letter, dated Nov. 21, which has been transmitted to me hither from Durham. As to my publishing your Letters, I hold myself fully justified by the injury you had done me by abusing me *infamously and atrociously* \* in your Appendix: an injury of that kind, though less in degree, would, by those very laws of society, which you say I have violated, have cancelled the obligation to secrecy, which you *absurdly* pretend I lay under in the present case, which arose from a *haughty* demand of satisfaction about a matter antecedently before the Public, and of which it came, in the event, proper that the Public should be informed of the whole circumstances.

You say, I had *grossly insulted you* in a Latin Note to the new edition of my Lectures. THE

\* This *abuse*, I suppose, is contained in the Bishop's saying, that *the learned Professor had been hardly brought up in the keen Atmosphere of WHOLESOME SEVERITIES*, meaning, as common sense required he should mean, *brought up in the Principles of Intolerance*, called by the intollerant Doctors, with whom Mr. Locke had to do, *wholesome severities*, and, by his comment, become famous. —I remember the Bishop formerly spoke of a People, whom he called *Answerers by profession*, meaning certain *Polemical Divines* he had then upon his hands, and the Dunces of that time said, he meant the LAWYERS. He now speaks of *the keen Atmosphere of wholesome Severities*, and the Dunces of this time say, he meant WINCHESTER and OXFORD.

CHARGE IS ABSOLUTELY FALSE: unless you are the author of a book intituled, A Free and Candid Examination of the Bishop of London's Sermons. But, had you been the author, where is *the gross insult*? As you declare that you have not yet, and believe you never shall read the Letter to *you*, which has been lately published by *me* (of which concession you may make whatever use you please) I will ask you here, how came your opinions, even when vented by other persons as their own, to be uncontrovertible, inviolable and sacred? And had such an act of self-defence, as my Note here referred to was, really been an *insult*, had it been even a *gross* insult on an INOFFENSIVE PERSON, how could it be esteemed such on ONE who has in a manner so NOTORIOUS, so LICENTIOUS and singularly SCANDALOUS, especially in one of his profession and order, ABUSED writers of all ranks and characters, civil and ecclesiastical, living and dead, as you have done\*?

The publication of the Letters was necessary, in justice either to you or me. If, as you seem to think, they tend to vindicate *your* honour, you are

\* And yet, if the account which has been given to the Bishop of the Doctor's printed letter to him, be true, (and he has reason to think it so from this very letter) there is more *abuse* in it than in all the Bishop's writings put together. — To select one curious particular. He charges the Bishop with having, in his Sermon preached before the King, last Lent, something reflecting on, or alluding to, particular Persons or transactions of a recent date. Now the man who affirmed this to the Doctor, (if any such there were) and the Doctor who affirms it to the Public, are infamous CALUMNIATORS. It is well known to several Persons of Consideration that this very Sermon, with every passage, (and in the very words) which gave birth to the CALUMNY, was written and preached, more than once, (and at Court too) many years ago.



so far obliged to me for acting so fairly by you, in doing you this justice with the Public. On the contrary, if they fix both the origin and the resumption of this dispute on *you*, I am then justified in taking this necessary step in order to vindicate *myself*. The decision I leave to the Public.

*I am, &c.*

ROB. LOWTH.

### LETTER III.

#### TO THE PROFESSOR.

*P. P. Dec. 2, 1765.*

Sir,

I HAVE received your very extraordinary letter of yesterday's date, this morning. One who had read your *printed* letter to me, said — *You affected to be jocular, while you was trembling with passion.* This, from Bath, is more consistent as well as more natural; the Passion remains, but the Wit, after such an expence of it, is evaporated. I regard both with equal complaisancy; and will therefore give you a plain answer to a *Letter*, which language does not afford a name for. You say you are fully justified in publishing my private letters, without my leave, on account of my abusing you *infamously* and *atrociously*. Your system of morals seems to be very uncommon. What! Will my transgressing one law of morality excuse you for transgressing another? It is agreed on all hands, that a private letter is the most sacred of all trusts. Lord Clarendon (whose current authority, I suppose, will go with you, as it does with all honest men) speaks of Lord Falkland's  
morals

morals, in this point, with high approbation — “ One thing (says the noble historian) he could “ never bring himself to, while Secretary of State, “ it was the liberty of opening Letters, upon a “ suspicion that they might contain matter of “ dangerous consequence; which he thought such “ a violation of the LAW OF NATURE, that no “ qualification of office could justify him in the “ trespass.” This, indeed, was going very far. What then would such a man have said of your *opening Letters*, in the grossest sense, (laying them before the Public) in matters where, certainly, the fate and fortune of Empires were not concerned? This, I say, is a matter agreed on amongst all men of honour. But is it a matter agreed on amongst all men of letters, that the charging you, (not to say, the convicting) from your own words, of being *an advocate for intolerance*, is ABUSING YOU INFAMOUSLY AND ATROCIOUSLY? If I had thus abused you, you had a right to repel that injury, and procure for yourself satisfaction in the best manner you were able. But did the seeking for this satisfaction absolve you from any of the obligations of Society? You was *abused*, you say — you have shewn the Public how able you are to *abuse* again.

I had said, I was *grossly insulted* in the latin note. You reply, *the charge is absolutely false, unless I and the Examiner be one and the same*. What! because my name is not mentioned in syllables at length, in this insult, therefore *the charge is absolutely false*? Ask any stranger, ask any of your acquaintance, ask any of your friends, whether they understood me or the *Examiner of the Bishop of London's Sermons* to be meant in the decent comparison to father Harduin? Indeed, Doctor, I blush for what you ought to blush, your own prevarication. But  
just

just so it was you served me (as may be seen by the printed Letters) when I charged you with reflecting on me, concerning the book of Job, in your Prelections. You did not mean me, forsooth, but somebody who had written before, on the same subject: and, for the sake of peace, I took this for good payment.

But you say — *supposing you was meant in the latin note* (I am glad to find in you the least spark of ingenuous dealing) *how comes it to pass that your opinions are uncontrovertible, inviolable and sacred?* How, indeed! when all the world knows, there is not a scribbling dunce in the kingdom but has been as free with my opinions as yourself. But you disguise the fact. The question is not how *sacred* I esteem my opinions; but whether there was not a *convention* made between us (for which I appeal to the printed Letters) to drop all opposition, on both sides, concerning the book of Job? Which Convention I inviolably kept, and you as insolently broke, on the force of this poor chicane, that, as the *Examiner of the Bishop of London's Sermons* had taken up the question, it was the same as if I had done it. But let me tell you, Sir, that the *Examiner* and I (as much as I value his friendship) are not one, but two: and let me tell you further, that the *Examination* (as much as I approve the learning and the logic of it) was not mine, but his. As a Divine, he wants no assistance from me — especially to support himself against you. Tho', in the *Appendix*, I reviewed what you had said on the question, both because he appeared to have suffered from the severity of your pen, for daring to espouse my notion of the book of Job against yours, and because I was insulted through his sides.



But you come down at last, though (as is commonly the case) the concession is more insulting than the offence, and say, that *admitting your Note had been a gross insult on an inoffensive person, how could it be esteemed such, on one who has in a manner so notorious, so licentious, and singularly scandalous, abused writers of all ranks and characters, civil and ecclesiastical, living and dead, as I have done?* — Give me leave, first of all, to laugh heartily at this mean paltry shred of dirty malice; and then I will give you an answer. — I own I have exposed, or, if you will, in your own language, *abused*, (and I hope to the no small service of Religion and my Country) *writers of all ranks and characters, civil and ecclesiastical, living and dead.* And now, Sir, I will tell your important self who they are, and in the very language in which I reckoned them up in public to your Betters. I said it to them, and I now say it to you — “ That  
 “ my life and health have been employed in the  
 “ service of Religion, in defending it against the  
 “ rude attacks of ribauld writers of all denomina-  
 “ tions,” (or in your language, *of all ranks and characters*) “ atheists, deists, libertines, free-  
 “ thinkers, BIGOTS and fanatics. This brought  
 “ down upon me a *fierce and dirty torrent of abuse*  
 “ *and slander* from all quarters. In which, how-  
 “ ever, not one opprobrious fact ever imputed to  
 “ my life (if any such have been imputed) was  
 “ true, or *one* fallacious argument ever imputed  
 “ to my writings has been proved. But while I  
 “ have this hydra of more heads than that in  
 “ Fable, at my feet, I can well bear with their  
 “ hisses.”

You conclude — (for this publication of *private Letters* seems not to sit easy in the digestion of your moral system) I say you conclude thus —

If

*If the publication of your letters, as you seem to think, tend to vindicate your honour, you are so far obliged to me for acting so fairly by you. — Yes, just so much as I should be obliged to an Affassin, who, shooting at me, should, by mistake, kill my enemy. — But (and I agree with you) if the Public fix both the origin and the resumption of the dispute with you, then (say you) I am justified, &c. In good truth, if such a PUBLIC be to be had for love or money, I freely consent you shall have the full enjoyment and patronage of it.*

W. GLOUCESTER.

#### LETTER IV.

#### TO THE BISHOP.

*Bath, Dec. 3, 1765.*

My Lord,

**I** HAVE this day received your *plain* letter of yesterday's date.

In it you have overhauled the whole affair, which is already before the Public with all its circumstances. The Public will judge of it more impartially than either you or I. I shall therefore say no more upon the case in general; and shall but just touch upon one or two particulars, which seem more direct and immediate answers to my last letter. Your quotation from Lord Clarendon is nothing at all to the purpose: the case is totally different in itself, in every circumstance, and in every light in which it can possibly be considered. And your argument *a fortiori*, FOUNDED ON A POOR QUIBBLE \* on the word *opening*, is as fine an

\* By this it would seem the learned Doctor was unable to distinguish between a *quibble* and an *equivalent expression*.

example of just logical deduction as your quotation is of judicious appeal to authority.

You say, — *I own I have exposed, or, if you will, abused writers of all ranks and characters, civil and ecclesiastical, living and dead.* HABEO CONFITENTEM REUM. You then enumerate the particulars contained under this general description. What then, are ALL WRITERS \* of *all* ranks and *all* characters either *atheists, deists, libertines, free-thinkers, bigots or fanatics*? are all of them *ribaulds*? They are so in your estimation, and you have treated them as *such*.

It is high time that an end be put to this correspondence; out of respect to myself, I will answer no more *such* letters.

ROBERT LOWTH.

## LETTER V.

### TO THE PROFESSOR.

P. P. Dec. 4, 1765.

Sir,

**I** RECEIVED your last insolent letter of December 3, which are become very familiar to me, for indeed I never received any other from you, even in your best humours.

But I *quibble* it seems, and *confess myself guilty*. What an advantage have you got over me! what pity would it be that you should not make the best of it. I will do all I can to assist you; and therefore, in the first place, I freely give you what,

\* It seems then, that ALL *Writers of all ranks*, and *Writers of all ranks* are equivocal expressions: and that therefore, the Bishop, who uses the latter words, may be fairly charged with the sense of the former.



I believe, I could with difficulty keep from you, the *benefit of the last word*. Those [*ribaulds*] with whom I have had hitherto to do, have always had the *first*; and this justified my treatment of *them*: and they have always had the *last*; and this encouraged them in their treatment of *me*. All I desire, in return, is, that you would permit me to give these five Letters to the Public; for my morals will not permit me to print your part of them without your leave.

W. GLOUCESTER.

LETTER VI.  
TO THE BISHOP.

Bath, Dec. 5, 1765.

My Lord,

**I** WILL answer *the concluding part* of your letter of yesterday.

You have, according to your desire, my free consent to publish my part of our correspondence, from Nov. 21. last to the present time, together with your own.

Were I now at liberty to revise my first letter, I should add two or three words to express my sense a little more fully towards the end of the second paragraph. As I am not, I take this opportunity of expressing it here, thus — “Of which, by  
“ the subsequent proceedings on *your* part, it be-  
“ came, in the event, proper that the Public  
“ should be informed of the whole circumstances.”

And I desire that this sixth letter may be added, in the publication, to the five preceding.

ROB. LOWTH.

LETTER VII.  
TO THE BISHOP.

*Durham, Jan. 24, 1766.*

My Lord,

**I** HAVE seen a printed Copy of your intended Edition of our late Correspondence. I have several Observations to make upon it: and in order to do myself justice, I now in my turn desire, that you would consent to my publishing your part of the said Correspondence, together with my own.

I am,

My Lord,

Your humble Servant,

ROBERT LOWTH.

LETTER VIII.  
TO THE PROFESSOR.

*Grosvenor-Square, Jan. 31, 1766.*

Sir,

**I** MIGHT well be excused in taking no notice of yours of the 24th from Durham, after you had told me, in one of yours from Bath, that you would have no further correspondence with me. But I am willing, under my incapacity of teaching

ing you any thing else, to teach you a little common civility.

I hardly know whether I understand you. If it were your purpose to ask my consent for the republication (in your own way) of the correspondence which passed between us since the publishing your LIBELL \* on me, and my private Letters without my consent; if this were your purpose, there was not the least need to ask it, after you had given your consent to the printing your part of the Correspondence. This, without more ado, gave you a reciprocal right to the other part; and you are heartily welcome to it. I will conclude with your last words in the 6th Letter—*I desire that this 8th Letter may be added, in the publication, to the Seven preceding.*

W. G.

\* Bacon or Williams (I know not which) defined a *Libel* to be a *lye* and a *bell* which proclaims it round the Country. I should rather define it to be a *lye* with an IMPRIMATUR.



ing you any thing else, to teach you a little

I have known whether I understand you. (It is  
 your purpose to make my consent for the re-  
 publication (in your own way) of the correspon-  
 dence which has passed between us since the publica-  
 tion of "The Standard" as one, and my private letters  
 without my consent; if this were your purpose,  
 it would be necessary to ask it, since you  
 have no right to publish my private letters  
 without my consent. I will conclude  
 your letter with a word of advice - I hope  
 you will be more careful in the future - I hope  
 you will be more careful in the future - I hope

[illegible]

